UC-NRLF
$B 489 597
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

REESE LIBRARY

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE LIVES OF THE POPES

VOL. I.—PART II

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE

LIVES OF THE POPES

IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

BY THE

REV. HORACE K. MANN

"De gente Anglorum, qui maxime familiares Apostolicæ Sedis semper existunt" (*Gesta Abb. Fontanel. A.D.* 747-752, ap. M.G. SS. II. 289).

HEAD MASTER OF ST. CUTHBERT'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE

VOL. I. (IN TWO PARTS)

THE POPES UNDER THE LOMBARD RULE

ST. GREGORY I. (THE GREAT) TO LEO III.

590-795

PART II.—657-795

ST. LOUIS, MO.

B. HERDER, 17 SOUTH BROADWAY

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO., LTD.

1902

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BX1070
M3
v.1;2

REESE

Nihil obstat:

ST. LOUIS, May 5th, 1902.

F. G. HOLWECK,
Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur:

ST. LOUIS, May 5th, 1902.

✠ JOHN J. KAIN,
Abp. St. Louis.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

To

J. F. WEIDNER, Esq., J.P.,

COUNCILLOR OF THE CITY OF NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE,

BY WHOSE KIND ASSISTANCE IT WAS PUBLISHED,

THIS VOLUME

Is gratefully Dedicated

BY

THE AUTHOR.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
VITALIAN (657–672),	1
ADEODATUS (672–676),	17
DONUS (676–678),	20
ST. AGATHO (678–681),	23
ST. LEO II. (682–683),	49
ST. BENEDICT II. (684–685),	54
JOHN V. (685–686),	64
CONON (686–687),	68
ST. SERGIUS I. (687–701),	77
JOHN VI. (701–705),	105
JOHN VII. (705–707),	109
SISINNIUS (708),	124
CONSTANTINE (708–715),	127
ST. GREGORY II. (715–731),	141
ST. GREGORY III. (731–741),	203
ST. ZACHARY (741–752),	225
STEPHEN II. (752) and STEPHEN III. (752–757),	289
ST. PAUL I. (757–767),	331
STEPHEN (III.) IV. (768–772),	361
HADRIAN I. (772–795),	394
APPENDIX—The two letters of Gregory II. to Leo III.,	498
INDEX,	503

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS VOLUME.

Jaffé, or Regesta . .	= *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. Jaffé, 2nd ed., Lipsiæ, 1885.
Labbe	= *Sacrosancta Concilia*, ed. Labbe and Cossart, Paris, 1671.
L. P., *Anastasius*, or the *Book of the Popes*	= *Liber Pontificalis*, 2 vols., ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, 1886.
M. G. H., or Pertz .	= *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, either *Scriptores* (M. G. SS.) or *Epistolæ* (M. G. Epp.).
P. G.	= *Patrologie Grecque*, ed. Migne.
P. L.	= *Patrologie Latine*, ed. Migne.
R. I. S. . . .	= *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. Muratori.

The sign † placed before a date indicates that the date in question is the year of the death of the person after whose name the sign and the date are placed.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

VITALIAN.

A.D. 657–672.

Sources.—The *L. P.* Some half dozen letters of the Pope, to be found in the 'Councils,' *e.g.*, Mansi, x., and Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87.

The history of Vitalian's relations with England will be found in Bede, *H. E.*, iii. and iv., etc.

Incidental notices of this Pope occur in Paul the Deacon, Theophanes, the Acts of the Sixth General Council, etc.

Emperors of the East.	Kings of the Lombards.	Exarchs of Ravenna.
Constans II., 642–668.	Aripert I., 653–661.	Theodore Calliopas, 653–664.
Constantine IV. (or V.) (Pogonatus), 668–685.	Perctarit and Godepert, 661–662.	Gregory, 664–677.
	Grimwald, 662–671.	
	Perctarit (second time), 672–688.	

Introductory.

In the first part of this volume we traced the careers of the popes through the first half of the seventh century. Of this century, through the dearth of records, very little is known in either East or West. It is a century which, while for this reason to us now dull and dark all over the civilised

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

world, was in the West, politically speaking,[1] uneventful, monotonous and quiet, and in the East violent and perturbed. For the Orient was agitated by the heresy of Monothelism and the sword of the Saracen. In the West it was the darkness of the mist, in the East the blackness of the storm.

This second part of the volume will see the dulness of the seventh century give place somewhat before the coming of the great popes of the eighth century and the dawn of the age of Charlemagne. It will see Monothelism swept into oblivion, the disappearance of the last shreds of the *Three Chapters*, the rise and fall of Iconoclasm; it will witness the expanse and collapse of the Lombard power in Italy; it will contemplate the definite passing of 'Roman' power in the peninsula from the nerveless fingers of the exarch, whence it had long been slipping, into the hands of the Sovereign Pontiffs; and it will view with satisfaction the consequent strengthening of the position of those who, with lasting honour to themselves, and with enduring benefit to the nations, were to take the proud position of Head of the Christian Commonwealth of the Medieval States of Europe.

Comparatively little known of this Pope.

Considering the fact that Vitalian reigned for fourteen years and a half, we know but little of his doings;

[1] For from the social and religious work, which was being accomplished in the West in this quiet age, by the bishops, and especially by the monks of St. Benedict, it was anything but uneventful. Hence, from the number of saintly workers it produced, this age is called by the great Benedictine of St. Maur, Mabillon, '*the golden age*.' For of the monks of St. Benedict in particular may be said what the great African Tertullian said of Christians in general: "In comparison with the catastrophes of former ages, those which happen now are less serious. For from the time when the world received Christians from God, their innocence has tempered the wickedness of the world, and there began to be those who could intercede for us with God." *Lib. Apol.*, c. 40. *Cf.* Pitra, *S. Léger*, introduc., p. vii. f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

absolutely nothing, for instance, of the first six years of his pontificate. Of what we do know, however, it is interesting to Englishmen to discover that a considerable portion has reference to this country. And to him we owe a debt of gratitude for having sent us one of the greatest men that have adorned the Church in this country—the Greek Theodore.

Birthplace of Vitalian.

The son of one Anastasius, a name, it will be observed, constantly cropping up in the history of the Church at this period, Vitalian was born at Segni, a town of the Campagna, on the 'Latin Road,' at the thirtieth milestone from the city, picturesquely situated on a height, and, as remains show, once possessed of extensive and massive fortifications. This town is also famous in history for having resisted the Volscians of old, and as the birthplace of that centre figure of the Middle Ages, Innocent III.

Consecrated Bishop of Rome, July 30, 657.

Vitalian's first act as Pope was to send his nuncios to Constantinople as bearers of his synodical letter 'to the most pious princes,' for Constantine was now a partner in the empire, to notify his consecration,[1] and to proclaim his faith. And we learn from the acts of the thirteenth session of the Sixth General Council that the Pope also wrote to the patriarch Peter to exhort him to return to the orthodox faith. The results of these letters were, on the part of the emperor, a present for St. Peter in the shape of a copy of the gospels written in letters of gold, and with its binding all adorned with fine jewels of exceptional size; and on the part of the patriarch a letter to the Pope, beginning: "The letter of your fraternity has given us spiritual joy." The Fathers of the Sixth Council found[2] that the passages of the

Letters to and from the Pope, the emperor and the patr. of Constantinople.

[1] *L. P.*

[2] Act. 13, ap. Labbe, vi. None of these letters are extant. This letter was evidently of the same obscure nature as the one he sent to Pope Eugenius, and seemed to inculcate three wills. For Pope Agatho (Ep. ad Const.) twice speaks of Peter sending a letter to Pope Vitalian

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ancient writers quoted by Peter in this letter in support of his doctrine of the One Will had been strangely mutilated.

It is very hard to understand this change of front towards the See of Rome on the part of Constans. Whether it was that his son Constantine had any influence over him; that he was overawed by the determined stand of the Pope and his legates, who, we are informed,[1] reasserted the privileges of the Church; or whether it was that, in view of the expedition he made later on against the Lombards in Italy, he thought it advisable to make a friend of the Pope, we do not know. Of one thing, against certain writers, we are certain, and that is that there was no truckling to Constans on the part of the Pope in the matter of Monothelism, though his letter may have been conceived in a very conciliatory tone. This we may conclude on both positive and negative grounds; from the firmness of his administration,[2] and from the fact that, despite the real or pretended opposition of Constantine Pogonatus, the name of Pope Vitalian was at length struck[3] off the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople; and that, too, though no Pope's name but his own had been inserted in them from Honorius to the Sixth General Council under Pope Agatho.

Synodical letter of Thomas II., patr. of Constantinople.

The attitude of the Pope on the One Will question may also be gathered from the fact that the orthodox patriarch, teaching "et unam, et duas voluntates et operationes in dispensatione incarnationis J. C."

[1] *L. P.*: "Renovantes privilegia Ecclesiæ." Muratori (*Annal.*, ad an. 657) refers these words to the Emperor Constans, "confermò (imperatore) i privilegi alla santa chiesa Romana." The sense we have given them is rather tentative than usual.

[2] *Ib.* "Hic regulam ecclesiasticam atque vigorem, ut mos erat, omnimodo conservavit."

[3] *Cf.* the letter of Const. to Pope Donus (ap. Labbe, vi.), in which he says he resisted for some time the demands that Vitalian's name should be struck off the diptychs, with the words of George, patriarch of Constant., praying that the name might be *reinserted*! The diptychs were registers of deceased Catholic bishops.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Thomas II., who succeeded Peter in 667, at once endeavoured to put himself in communication with Vitalian. The synodical letter he wrote to the Pope, which the Fathers of the Sixth General Council pronounced quite sound on the matter of the two wills,[1] never got despatched to Rome owing to the troubles caused by the Saracens. Two more orthodox prelates (John V., 669–674, and Constantine I., 674–676) succeeded Thomas. John inserted Vitalian's name in the diptychs, and Theodore I. (676-678), a Monothelite, succeeded in getting the name removed.

Visit of Constans to Rome, 663.

We do not hear of Vitalian again till the approach of Constans to Rome. In the year 662 Constans, for some reason, determined to transfer the seat of empire from Constantinople to Rome.[2] His main object may have been a wish to recover Italy from the grasp of the Lombards, but Theophanes avers, and *a priori* reasons would render likely, it was unpopularity at home that caused Constans to make the attempt to divert ill-feeling from himself, by concentrating public attention on enemies abroad. His unpopularity was caused, says the chronicler, by the murder of his brother Theodosius (*c.* 660) and his treatment of Pope Martin, St. Maximus and 'many other orthodox men,' who would not approve of his heresy. Landed in Italy, he soon found he was no match in arms for Grimwald and his Lombards.[3] He fell back on Rome, and, as "he could do nothing against the Lombards, he raged against the defenceless Romans."[4] However, as far as his relations with the Pope were concerned, Constans

[1] *Cf.* the letter of Const. to Pope Donus (ap. Labbe, vi.).

[2] Theoph., *Chron.*, ad ann. 653, 660. *Cf.* Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, ii. 297 f.

[3] Paulus Diac., v. 6 *seq.*

[4] *Ib.*, c. 11. "Cum nihil se contra Langobardos gessisse conspiceret (Constans) omnes sævitiæ suæ minas contra suos, hoc est Romanos, retorsit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was amicable enough. On receiving news of his approach, the Pope and clergy went out (June 5, 663) to the sixth milestone on the Appian Way to meet him. For twelve days the emperor remained in Rome, making offerings[1] to the various churches, and living apparently on the best terms with the Pope. On his side Vitalian, either making a virtue of necessity, or because he believed that a mild answer turns away wrath, showed no hostility to the emperor. If Constans was considerate to the Pope, he was not so to Rome. He carried off[2] all the bronze ornaments of the city, and even stripped the Church of Our Lady 'ad Martyres,' or the Pantheon, of its gilt bronze tiles! With this plunder, this protector of his people withdrew to Naples, and thence in the same year (663) to Sicily. Here for four years he did nothing but wring taxes[3] from the people of Sicily, Calabria, Africa and Sardinia, rob the very churches of their sacred vessels, and sell the people into slavery for money; so that well might the chronicler add that life was not worth having. Like so many other persecutors of the Church, he died a violent death, being assassinated[4] in a bath (July 15, 668). At his death the army and the officials (*judices*) in Sicily elected an emperor of their own, one Mizizius or Mecetius. And now we cannot but read with surprise that the Pope used[5] his influence with considerable vigour in helping to

Constans crosses over into Sicily, 663.

His death.

Abortive rebellion of Mizizius, 668.

[1] *L. P.*

[2] "Omnia quæ erant in ære ad ornatum civitatis deposuit," etc. (*ib.*). *Cf.* Paulus D., v. 11.

[3] Concerning which Bede (De sex ætat. ad an. 671) says they were 'unparalleled'; and Paul the Deacon and the *L. P.*: "quales a sæculo numquam fuerant."

[4] Theop. in *Chron.* and the above authorities.

[5] That Constantine was indebted to Vitalian in no small degree for the successful termination of this rebellion we have on the very best authority, viz., from Constantine himself in a letter which he wrote to Pope Donus (ap. Labbe, vi., or ap. Migne, t. 87, p. 1152, *P. L.*), in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

put down the rebellion. Troops poured into Sicily from Italy, Africa, etc., and when the young Constantine arrived from Constantinople, he found that the usurper was no more. When he had returned to Constantinople, the Saracens made a descent upon Sicily (669), and captured Syracuse, and with it the plunder Constans had taken[1] from Rome! So little does property sacrilegiously acquired ever permanently profit its dishonest possessors!

Vitalian and England. (1) The monastery of Medeshampstede, 664.

We must now retrace our steps to the year 664. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells[2] how Peada, the first Christian king of the Mercians, and Oswin, King of Northumbria, "came together and agreed that they would rear a monastery to the glory of Christ and the honour of St. Peter. And they did so, and named it 'Medeshampstede' (Peterborough), ... and committed it to a monk who was called Saxewulf." Wulfhere, the brother and successor of Peada, resolved, with the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Deusdedit, and "by the counsel of all his 'witan,' both clergy and laity," to finish the work begun by his brother and to endow the monastery. "And he did so." And after the monastery had been blessed by the archbishop, in presence of the king and all his bishops and nobles, the king declared: "And thus *free* I will make this minster that it be subject to Rome alone." Wulfhere understood well enough what so many,

which he speaks of the "collata nobis charitas ab Vitaliano, dum superesset, in motione tyrannorum nostrorum."

[1] Vid. Paul. Diac., *Hist. L.*, v. 12, 13; Theop. in *Chron.*, ad an. 660; *L. P.* in Vit. 'Adeodat'; Amari, *Storia dei Mussilmani in Sicilia*, i. 84 n., has found an interesting detail of this raid in an Arab chronicle of the ninth century, from which it appears that India was then a good market for valuable objects.

[2] Ad ann. 655, 657. We use the translation of the Protestant editors of the series of *The Church Historians of England*. *Cf.* Bede, iv. 6. For what is to be said on the spuriousness of these documents see Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 100 n., *b*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

even Catholic bishops, have to their own cost often enough failed to understand, viz., that a Church is then most *free* when it is most subject to the See of Rome; and, of course, the less subject to the See of Rome the less free, the more the slave and creature of the State. But Wulfhere was anxious for his 'soul's redemption,' and he prayed that "the heavenly gate-ward (viz. St. Peter) would take in heaven from the man who took from his gift and the gifts of other good men"; and he confirmed the charters granting all the presents and privileges to the monastery (A.D. 664), "I, King Wulfhere, with the kings and earls and dukes and thanes, the witnesses of my gift, do confirm it, before the Archbishop Deusdedit, with the Cross of Christ." "When," adds the chronicler, "these things were done, the king sent to Rome to Vitalian, who then was Pope, and desired that he should grant by his writing and with his blessing all the before-mentioned things." The wished-for bull was granted, the Pope praying that St. Peter would exterminate with his sword or open with his keys the gates of heaven, according as what he decreed was contravened or obeyed.

Later on the monastery was destroyed by the Danes, and we are told by the *Saxon Chronicle* (ann. 963) that when its site was visited by Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester, "he found nothing there but old walls and wild woods. There found he, hidden in the old walls, writings that Abbot Headda had erewhile written, how King Wulfhere and Athelred his brother had built it, and how they had freed it against king and against bishop, and against all secular services, and how the Pope Agatho had confirmed the same by his rescripts, and the Archbishop Deusdedit."

All these details, however, in connection with the foundation of this monastery are only to be read in one MS.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This MS. (Bodleian, 636) seems to have been transcribed in the year 1122; and, from the numerous entries in it that relate to Peterborough, it is thought to have belonged to that monastery. It is further supposed that the charters we have just quoted also first saw the light in the twelfth century. No doubt, as they now appear in the Bodleian MS., they are not exact copies of the deeds of Wulfhere and Vitalian. Still, as there is no doubt that the monastery of Peterborough was founded about this time; and as there is no doubt that, as early as the beginning of the seventh century, the custom of placing monasteries under papal protection had begun, it is far more likely that the Peterborough documents of the *Saxon Chronicle* were more or less faithful copies of genuine originals than that they were absolute forgeries. It is in this belief that they have been cited here—the more so that comparatively little is urged against them even in the form in which they now exist.

(2) Wighard.

The archbishop (Deusdedit), in whose presence the consecration of the monastery of Peterborough is said to have taken place, died soon after (July 14, 664), and by the joint action of Oswin or Oswy, the powerful king of Northumbria, and Bretwalda ("who, though educated[1] by the Scots, perfectly understood that the Roman was the Catholic and Apostolic Church"), and Egbert of Kent, one Wighard, who had been trained by the apostles whom Pope Gregory had sent to England, was sent[2] to Rome to be consecrated archbishop of Canterbury. On arriving at Rome, Wighard made known the occasion of his journey to the Pope. But unfortunately, "with almost

[1] Bede, *H. E.*, iii. 29. "Quamvis educatus a Scottis, quia Romana esset catholica et apostolica Ecclesia veraciter intellexerat."

[2] Bede, *ib.*, and iv. 1; and *Hist. Abbat. Wir.*, n. 3; *A. S. Chron.*, ad an. 667.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

all who went with him," he was cut off by a pestilence. This Vitalian notified Oswy in a letter,[1] written probably in 665, in which he praises his faith, exhorts him to follow the traditions of those two great lights of the Church, Peter and Paul, not only with regard to the Easter question, but in all other points, tells him that he has not been able to find a man suitable, "in accordance with the tenour of his (Oswy's) letters," to be consecrated bishop for England, but that he will send the first proper person he can find, and thanks the king for the presents he has sent him. "We therefore[2] beg your highness to make haste to dedicate all your island to Christ our God . . . . who will prosper it in all things, that it may bring together a new people of Christ, establishing there the Catholic and Apostolic faith." Truly the Pope, being the high priest of that year, prophesied. After having made every effort to secure a proper person, Vitalian finally fixed on a Greek monk who was in Rome, and who was as distinguished for his good life as for his learning, both sacred and profane.[3] This monk, named Theodore, resembled St. Paul not only in having been born at the same place, viz. Tarsus in Cilicia, but also in many points of his character. Both were learned, both men of fiery energy (though Theodore was nearer seventy years of age than sixty when he landed in England), and both eaten up with zeal for the glory of God. Such was the man whom Vitalian in his wisdom ordained[4] (March 26, 668) for the English Church, to

(3) Archbishop Theodore.

[1] Ap. Bede, iii. 29.

[2] *Ib.* "Festinet igitur, quæsumus, vestra celsitudo, ut optamus, totam suam insulam Deo Christo dedicare . . . . qui (Christus) ei cuncta prospera impertiet, ut novum Christi populum coarcervet, catholicam ibi et apostolicam constituens fidem."

[3] Bede, *H. E.*, iv. 1; *Hist. Abbat. Wir.*, n. 3.

[4] *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

whom he subjected [1] all the churches in Britain, and whom he sent off to England (May 668) with letters of commendation to John, metropolitan of Arles. It is not for the historian of the popes to tell of the doings of Theodore in England. Suffice it to say that to him, and so to Pope Vitalian, who sent him, the English people owe the deepest debt of gratitude. By his energetic efforts to establish ecclesiastical unity in England, he did more than any other man to make us the united people we afterwards became. He inaugurated the golden age of England; "for our kings,[2] being very brave men and very good Christians, were a terror to all barbarous nations, and the minds of all men were bent upon the joys of the heavenly kingdom of which they had just heard, and all who desired to be instructed in sacred reading had masters at hand to teach them." Theodore ranks with those other great archbishops of Canterbury, Anselm, Lanfranc, and St. Thomas à Becket, to whom Englishmen owed the establishment and propagation of such religious maxims and practice as made this country known to the world as the 'island of saints,' and to whom Englishmen of the present day even are largely indebted for being the freest people on God's earth.

Maurus, archbishop of Ravenna, aims at ecclesiastical autonomy, 666.

In the history of every widely extended empire we read of attempts, more or less successful, on the part of subordinate rulers to throw off or lessen their dependence on the supreme authority, and to make themselves as far as possible independent. It has been with the Church as with

[1] Ep. Vit. ad Theod., ap. Will. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, i. (ed. Migne, *P. L.*, 179, p. 1466). "Nobis visum est commendare tuæ sagacissimæ sanctitati omnes ecclesias in insula Britanniæ positas." (*V. sup.*, Pt. I. p. 272, etc.)

[2] Bede, *H. E.*, iv. 2. Vide Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iv. p. 195 *seq.*; Lingard, *A. Sax. Church*, i. p. 66 *seq.*; Alzog, *Hist. of the Church*, ii. 61.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

temporal kingdoms. The subject powers in the Church who carried matters to the greatest extremes were the patriarchs of Constantinople. Bishops of a city second to none in the empire, they thought that they themselves should be second to none in the Church, that they should be in the Church what the emperor was in the State. At the period of which we are now treating, Maurus, Archbishop of Ravenna, began to entertain somewhat similar views. To him the residence of the exarchs made Ravenna politically the first city in Italy, and himself at least as important as the other great bishops of Milan and Aquileia. He would therefore, like them, be more his own master; would be, as it was then grandly called, 'autocephalous.' In 649 Maurus was submissive enough, and came, or rather sent, his legates to Rome when summoned to the Lateran synod by Pope Martin. But in 666, despite the canons of the council of Nice and everything else, he refused to come to Rome to tender his respects[1] to the Holy See. Encouraged, perhaps inspired, by Constans, Maurus replied to a letter of the Pope excommunicating him, by insolently attempting the excommunication of the Pope. Both Vitalian and Maurus wrote to the emperor. As might have been expected, an imperial edict,[2] dated "Syracuse, March 1st,

[1] This affair has been handed down to us by Agnellus himself, a bishop of Ravenna, who about 840 wrote the *Lives of the Bishops of Ravenna*, in a spirit hostile to the See of Rome. These lives have been printed by Muratori, *R. I. S.*, ii.[1]; Migne, *P. L.*, t. 106, and in the *M. G. H.* (*Cf.* Murat., *Annal.*, vii. 48.)

[2] A copy of this interesting document was found in the library that belonged to the house of Este. It began: "Kalend. Mart. Syrasusa. Imperantibus Dominis nostris piisimis perpetuis Augustis, Constantino majore Imperatore (sc. Constans), anno xxv.," etc. . . . . "Privilegiis eam (Ecclesiam Ravennæ) munientes, quibus ab omni majoris sedis ditione exui et sui esse juris eam sanctamque ejus apostolicam ecclesiam sancivimus . . . . Sancimus . . . . et non subjacere (eam) pro quolibet modo patriarchæ antiquæ urbis Romæ, sed manere eam autocephalon . . . . sicut reliqui metropolite." He is to be consecrated by the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the 25th year of the reign of Constans" (viz. 666), was straightway issued to Maurus, in which the emperor stated that orders had been sent to the exarch Gregory in favour of Maurus, and in which he decreed that the Church of Ravenna should in future not be subject to any ecclesiastical superior, especially to the patriarch of 'Old Rome,' but should be 'Autocephalous.' It is believed that this is the document which contemporary mosaics on the left wall of the 'mighty basilica' of St. Apollinaris in Classis (a sort of suburb of Ravenna) exhibit as being handed to Reparatus, the successor of Maurus, and marked 'Privilegium.' To as many as are not Erastians, but are lovers of justice and respecters of Canon Law, this act of Constans will be correctly set down as tyrannical, and fully justifies the reflection of Muratori:[1] "Ma di che non era capace quest' empio ed infelice Augusto!" Though Reparatus "again subjected[2] the Church of Ravenna to the Apostolic See," there was more or less friction till the Pontificate of Leo II., when Constantine Pogonatus[3] (the Bearded) undid the work of his father, and the bishop of Ravenna had to give up his 'Privilegium.'

To prevent any misconstruction as to the meaning of the decree of Constans, which has reached us only in a very corrupt condition, or any misapprehension as to the aims of the bishop of Ravenna, and to prevent it being

bishops of his own diocese, and '*nostræ divinitatis sanctione*,' have the use of the pallium (*Mon. Germ. Scr. Langob.*, p. 350). The archbishops of Ravenna wanted to be as the archbishops of Milan and Aquileia, and not to be included in the direct metropolitical jurisdiction of the See of Rome. They did not take up a schismatical attitude like the archbishops of Aquileia.

[1] *Annal.*, vi. 330.

[2] *L. P.* in Vit. Doni.

[3] *L. P.* in vit. S. Leo II. "Typum autocephaliæ, quem sibi elicuerant, ad amputanda scandala sedis Apostolicæ restituerunt." See on p. 46, and *cf.* Muratori, *Annal.*, vi. 328 *seq.*, 347; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vi. 347.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

thought that he had any intention of becoming a schismatic and cutting himself off from all subjection to Rome, a few facts connected with the various degrees of ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised by the Pope must be borne in mind.

Before the middle of the fourth century, the direct and immediate jurisdiction of the Pope, as a primate or metropolitan, extended over all Italy. All matters concerning the election of bishops, for instance, in the parts subject to his metropolitical jurisdiction, had to be referred to him directly. But before the middle of the fifth century the direct and immediate jurisdiction over northern Italy had passed into the hands of the metropolitans of Milan, Aquileia and Ravenna. The position of Ravenna, however, among the other metropolitans was peculiar. His metropolitical jurisdiction extended only over Aemilia, which was, therefore, outside the sphere of the Pope's authority as primate. The complex nature, then, of the position of the bishop of Ravenna lies in this, as Duchesne[1] explains. In the *primatial* province of Rome, in which his See of Ravenna was situated, he was but a simple bishop; whereas over Aemilia he was a metropolitan. To be thus inferior to his brethren of Milan and Aquileia did not suit the bishop of Ravenna. He, therefore, aspired to be *autocephalous*, *i.e.*, to be in all respects like the bishops just named. And this he sought for and obtained at the hands of Constans.[2]

[1] *L. P.*, i. p. cxxix and p. 348. Greenwood's conclusion (*Cathedra Petri*, i. 449) is to the same effect as that of Duchesne. "It appears, therefore, that neither Maurus nor the emperor intended any more than to secure to the ecclesiastical province of Ravenna the ordinary canonical privileges of all metropolitan churches; that, namely, of choosing and consecrating their own archprelate."

[2] And so the decree (*ubi sup.*): "Sancimus . . . . manere eam (Ravennatem ecclesiam) autocepalon . . . . sicut reliqui metropolite per diversas rei publicæ manentes provincias, qui et a propriis consecratus episcopis."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

This difference will be noted between the results of the revolts of subordinate princes in temporal empires and in that of the Church. In the one case the dismemberment of the earthly kingdom has sooner or later inevitably been the consequence. In the case of the Church, the one result has been to strengthen the position of its Head, the Pope. The great ones in the supernatural realm of the Church, such as the patriarchs of Constantinople, who, from time to time in the course of its history have endeavoured to free themselves from subjection to the See of Peter—where are they now? So insignificant are they, that they are scarcely names in the civilised world!

The case of John, Bishop of Lappa, 667.

For some cause, which is nowhere stated, John, Bishop of Lappa in Crete, had been condemned by his metropolitan Paul, Archbishop of Crete, and his suffragans. John appealed to Rome, and begged the Pope that, "in accordance[1] with the sacred canons and the institutions of the Holy Fathers," he would enquire into his case and pass sentence according to his deserts. The Pope accordingly summoned a synod (December 667); and, very indignant at the high-handed manner in which John had been treated, especially at the effort Paul had made to prevent the execution of John's appeal to Rome, the synod declared John innocent, annulled the sentence that had been passed upon him, and ordained that reparation should be made him for the losses he had sustained. Paul was exhorted by the Pope to carry out his sentence that he (Paul) might not experience the rigour of the canons.[2] Vitalian also wrote to Vaanus,

[1] "Nos obnixe postulavit . . . . ut secundum sacratissimos canones, institutaque sanctorum Patrum ejus causæ meritum requireremus, et sententiam promulgaremus." Ep. 1 Vital., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87, p. 999; or Mansi, xi., etc. It is principally from this letter that this incident is known to us.

[2] "Itaque . . . . statuimus per hujus nostræ præceptionis auctoritatem, omnia quæ a te tuaque synodo contra canonum instituta

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the emperor's chamberlain, and to George, Bishop of Syracuse, to see that John was restored to his See. Where are we to find a part of the Church from which appeals have not been directed to the Holy See from the time that that part has had any Christian history at all? In all ages of the Church the wronged and the oppressed have ever felt that they had still a source of comfort and strength, and that hope was not dead for them as long as they had Rome to appeal to. To a Christian the appeal to the See of Peter is, and ever has been, as the appeal to Cæsar for the Roman.

Death of Vitalian, 672.

Vitalian was buried in St. Peter's, January 27, 672, and is on that day commemorated in the Roman Martyrology.

contraque legum decreta gesta confectave sunt, vel sententiam promulgatam adversus eum, inania et vacua esse," wrote the Pope to the metropolitan. This letter is dated Aug. 27, 668.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ADEODATUS.

A.D. 672–676.

Sources.—Practically the only source is the short 'life' in the *L. P.* Copies of two acts of this Pope exempting monasteries from episcopal control are to be found in Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87. pp. 1141–5.

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine IV. (or V.) (Pogonatus), 668-685.	Perctarit (second time), 672–688.	Gregory, 664–677.

Little known of this Pope and his successor.

Of Popes Adeodatus and his successor Donus, it may be said in a word that we know nothing of them or their acts, save that they were good men, made a few improvements in the fabrics of some of the churches, and, with more or less wisdom, exempted a monastery or two from episcopal control.

Consecration of Adeodatus, April 11, 672.

Adeodatus was a Roman, and the son of Jovinian. So far resembling St. Gregory I., he was called to be Pope from being a monk in a monastery [1] on the Coelian Hill (viz., that of St. Erasmus). He was consecrated April 11, 672.

His character.

Of such a gentle and kind disposition was this Pontiff, that he allowed everyone, great and small, ready access to

[1] *L. P.* As *Adeodatus* and *Deusdedit* have the same meaning in Latin, Adeodatus is sometimes called Deusdedit II.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

himself, was most affable to strangers, made everyone feel that they would get from him whatever they wanted, and increased the allowance or donative (*roga*) the popes were in the habit of making to the clergy and others.

Building operations.

Apart from additions he made to his monastery [1] on the Coelian, he restored the Church of St. Peter in the Campus Meruli, on the Via Portuensis, between the ninth and eleventh milestones from the city. The same locality is still known as the Campo di Merlo. His monastery of St. Erasmus was originally established in the house of the Valerii, perhaps the most honoured of all Rome's great patrician families. Adeodatus endowed it with the revenues of many estates, concerning which an inscription, some marble fragments of which were found by De Rossi, still exists.

Privileges to monasteries.

Wilkins, in his collection of British Councils, and other editors of 'Councils,' have preserved for us a decree [2] of this Pope (*c.* 674), forbidding, at the request of Hadrian, the abbot and companion of Archbishop Theodore, the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul at Canterbury to be harassed by anyone, whether cleric or lay, and forbidding anyone to be foisted on the monastery as abbot but the one lawfully elected by the monks themselves.

About the same time the Pope addressed a letter to all

[1] Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 347.

[2] Thomas Sprott, a Benedictine monk of St. Augustine's at Canterbury, who wrote about the year 1270, says of this decree, not in his *Chronicle* strictly so called (as the editor's note in Migne would lead one to suppose), but in his *Lives of the Abbots of Canterbury*, afterwards used by William Thorn a century later, in his continuation of the *Lives* down to his own time: "After Hadrian became abbot of the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, he obtained a privilege from Pope Adeodatus on the freedom of the monastery and on the election of its abbots. Of this document we have not the original (sub plumbo) but only a transcript." Of course, this statement is reproduced in Thorn, *Chron.*, c. 3, § 2. *Cf.* the introduction to Sprott's *Chronicle* by its first editor, Bell (Liverpool, 1851).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the bishops of Gaul, informing them that, though the Holy See[1] was not wont to exempt monasteries from episcopal control, still, as Crotpert, the bishop of Tours, had himself exempted the monastery of St. Martin, he would confirm the exemption of this house from the jurisdiction of the ordinary.

In this connection we may remark that, however advantageous it was, not only for themselves but for civilisation at large, that at times the monks should be freed from dependence on the local bishop, there is no doubt that the general acquisition of this privilege was fatal to the best interests of the monks themselves. It is with communities as with individuals. They cannot think too highly of the good they do, nor too lightly of the harm. And it was much easier to hide a diminution of virtue and a growth of worldliness from the distant Bishop of Rome than from the local 'ordinary.' Hence, when with the lapse of time the degeneration, which overtakes everything of this earth, fell upon the monastic orders, the exemptions they had secured, ensured their ruin.

Adeodatus was buried in St. Peter's, June 16, or 17 according to Duchesne, 676. Death of Adeodatus, 676.

[1] Very wise was and is the custom of the Holy See not to free monasteries from the jurisdiction of the bishop in whose diocese they are. "Mos atque traditio sanctæ nostræ Ecclesiæ plus non suppetat a regimine episcopalis providentiæ religiosa loca secernere," writes Pope Adeodatus. The authenticity of this letter has been much debated in France. But Pagi (*Brev. Gest. P. R.* in vit. Adeod., n. 3) and others have shown it to be genuine.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DONUS.

A.D. 676–678.

Source.—The 'life,' very short, in the *L. P.*

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarchs of Ravenna.
Constantine Pogonatus, 668–685.	Perctarit (second time), 672–688.	Gregory, 664–677. Theodore, 677–687.

Consecration of Donus, Nov. 2, 676.

AFTER an interval of 138 days, during which, we are told, took place the most fearful storms in the memory of man,[1] there was consecrated as bishop of Rome, Donus, himself a Roman, and the son of one Maurice.

Repairs churches, etc.

During his short reign, of about a year and a half, Donus flagged the atrium or quadrangle[2] in front of St. Peter's with great pieces of marble, and restored the Church of St. Euphemia on the Appian Way, a church that no longer exists, and the basilica of St. Paul on the Ostian Way, or, according to the very probable conjecture of Duchesne, the little church on the left of the road going to St. Paul's,

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Adeod.: "Quales (tempestates) nullas ætas hominum meminit esse"! It is astonishing how often such storms, nevertheless, do occur! Had it not been, we are further informed, that God's mercy was won by daily 'Litanies,' the necessary pursuits of agriculture could not have been conducted.

[2] *L. P.* Paul the Deacon, *De Gest. L.*, v. c. 31.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

outside the walls, where tradition tells that SS. Peter and Paul parted on their way to martyrdom. Discovering in a monastery, which was called after Boëthius, that there were a body of Nestorian Syrian monks there, Donus dispersed them through the various monasteries in Rome, to do penance or to prevent them from spreading their tenets in the city, and gave over the monastery to Roman monks.

Submission of Reparatus of Ravenna, but opposition of Theodore of Constantinople.

As we have noted above, Reparatus, Archbishop of Ravenna, just before his death submitted to Pope Donus.[1] But if one great bishop showed himself dutiful to the Pope, it was not the case with Theodore, the patriarch of Constantinople, who, succeeding three successive Catholic prelates, became patriarch in the same year that Donus became Pope. A letter concerning the settlement of the Monothelite question, which Constantine Pogonatus addressed to Donus, but which was delivered to Agatho, as Donus was dead when the letter arrived,[2] informs us that Theodore, the patriarch of Constantinople, did not send a synodical letter to Pope Donus. "He feared,"[3] adds the emperor, "that it would be rejected by the Pope, like those of his predecessors had been." The patriarch confined himself to sending a letter exhorting to peace. Whether Donus returned any answer to this letter, or whether even he was alive when it reached Rome, is not known.

Death of Donus, 678.

The very little that his biographer tells us of Donus terminates with the usual, "he was buried at St. Peter's"

[1] *L. P.*, and Agnellus *in vit. Rep.*, c. 116; and note 5 of Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 348-9.

[2] Ep. Const., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87, p. 1147; also ap. Mansi, xi., etc. News must at times have travelled slowly between Rome and Constantinople. Though Donus was buried Apr. 11, 678, Constantine's letter addressed to him is dated Aug. 12, 678!

[3] "Suggessit (Theodorus) suspectum se esse, dirigere consueta synodica ad vestram paternam beatitudinem, ne forsan non recipiantur, sicut et prædecessoribus ejus patriarchis factum est."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(April 11, 678). His portrait, with that of Honorius, was once to be seen in a mosaic which he himself erected in the Church of St. Martina, in the Forum. The present Church of St. Martina stands on the site of the mediæval Church, and that, again, stood on the site of the offices of the Senate House (*secretarium senatus*).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. AGATHO.

A.D. 678-681.

Sources.—A rather longer 'life' in the *L. P.*, the work of a contemporary (*cf.* Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 356). A few letters of the Pope and others in connection with the Sixth General Council, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87; Theophanes in *Chron.*; Bede, *H. E.*, iv., for Agatho's relations with England.

Modern Works.—*Cf.* a learned, but prolix, dissertation, "Della patria, santità, e dottrina del Pontefice Santo Agatone," by M. Scavo (Diss. IV., vol. 18 of Zaccaria's *Raccolta di Dissert.*).

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine Pogonatus, 668–685.	Perctarit (second time), (672–688).	Theodore, 677–687.

Importance of the reign of Agatho.

THOUGH Pope Agatho reigned but for a short time, his name is conspicuous in the history of the Church, not only because he is honoured as a saint[1] both by the Greeks and Latins, but because in his pontificate was celebrated the Sixth Œcumenical Council, the third of Constantinople (680), in which one more of the errors

[1] So great was his reputation for sanctity that he was honoured with the title of 'Thaumaturgus' or 'Wonder-worker' in the Menology of the emperor Basil, and in the Greek Menæon. (On the Menæon and the Greek Menologies, *cf.* Introduc. to Butler's *Lives of the Saints.*) In the Roman Martyrology (Jan. 10), we read of Agatho: "Qui sanctitate et doctrina conspicuus quievit in pace."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(Monothelism) that arose from a false view of the nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ was condemned.

As what is known of the actions of Agatho practically centres round this country and the General Council, his doings in connection with the Church in England, and then with the Council, will here be treated of after a little has been said of the Pope himself.

Early career of Agatho.

A Sicilian by birth,[1] and by profession a monk, Agatho was a man of remarkable affability and generosity. He had a cheerful word and a smile for everybody,[2] and was especially kind to his clergy. He would seem also to have had a turn for finance, as, 'contrary to custom,' when he became Pope, he took into his own hands the office of treasurer of the Roman Church, and, with the aid of a nomenclator, himself transacted the business of the treasury. Ill health, to which he alludes in his letter to Constantine, forced Agatho to appoint a treasurer with full powers as usual.

Agatho, Pope, June 27, 678.

It is not quite certain whether Agatho was consecrated in June or July, as the data in the *Book of the Popes* do not tally. We are, however, disposed to agree with Pagi and Duchesne, and to assign that event to Sunday, June 27, 678.

Agatho and England.

For the fifth time the indefatigable abbot of Wearmouth, Benedict Biscop, appeared in Rome in the early days of the pontificate of Agatho to obtain "for the ornament[3] and

[1] By the general tradition of Sicily, Palermo was the place of Agatho's birth. There seems to be some reason to believe that the Pope was the same Agatho concerning whom Pope St. Gregory I. wrote to Urbicus, abbot of St. Hermes in Palermo. Gregory wrote (vi. 47 al. 48) that the abbot was to receive Agatho into the monastery, if his wife also was willing to embrace conventual life. If this conjecture is well founded, it gives plenty of material for the imagination to build up a romantic early life of a centenarian pontiff! *Cf.* Dissert. of Scavo.

[2] "Tantum benignus et mansuetus fuit, ut etiam omnibus hilaris et jucundus comprobaretur." *L. P.*

[3] Bede, *Vit. abbat. Wiremuth.*, § 6, and *H. E.*, iv. 18.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

defence of his Church" what he could not find even in Gaul. Acting in accordance with the wish of Egfrid, King of Northumbria, who had given the land for the Wearmouth monastery, Benedict obtained from the Pope a charter of privileges for the said monastery, and leave to take back with him to England John, the arch-chanter of St. Peter's, to "teach in his monastery[1] the method of singing throughout the year, as it was practised in St. Peter's at Rome." John had, moreover, been commissioned by the Pope "carefully to inform himself concerning the faith of the English Church, and to give an account thereof on his return to Rome." "For," continues Bede, "the Pope was desirous of being informed concerning the state of the Church in Britain, as well as in other provinces, and to what extent it was chaste from the contagion of heretics."[2] To satisfy the Pope,[3] the famous synod of Heathfield or Hatfield was summoned by Archbishop Theodore (September 17, 680). The faith in England was found to be sound on all points. A profession of faith was drawn up and sent to Rome, "and most thankfully received by the Apostolic Pope and all those that heard or read it."

It is *said* that there was also read at this same synod a letter[4] of Pope Agatho, confirming, at the request of Ethelred, King of the Mercians, Archbishop Theodore

[1] Bede, *Vit. abbat. Wiremuth.*, § 6, and *H. E.*, iv. 18.

[2] The heresy of the Monothelites is, of course, especially alluded to.

[3] "Quamobrem collecta *pro hoc* in Brittania synodo quam diximus, inventa est in omnibus fides inviolata catholica," *ib.* This fact is *not* mentioned in the latest Anglican *History of the English Church*, by W. Hunt.

[4] To be found in full in *Haddan and Stubbs*, iii. 153 f.; and in part in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ad an. 675. We quote from the latter and use the translation of the Protestant editors of the series, *Church Historians of England.* Most writers agree that there are at least interpolations in the text of this letter; certainly where the abbot is made the Pope's legate!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and others, for the abbey of Medehampstede (afterwards known as Peterborough), of which we have spoken before, exemption from payment of taxes or military service to king, bishop, or earl; and forbidding the 'ordinary' or 'shire-bishop' to perform any episcopal functions within the monastery except at the request of the abbot. "And it is my will," says the Pope, "that the abbot (of Medehampstede) be holden as legate of Rome over all the island, and that whatsoever abbot shall be there chosen by the monks, be consecrated by the archbishop of Canterbury. I will and concede that whatever man shall have made a vow to go to Rome, which he may be unable to fulfil through sickness or any other cause, let him come to the monastery of Medehampstede and have the same forgiveness of Christ and St. Peter, and of the abbot and of the monks, that he should have if he went to Rome." "This decree,"[1] says our earliest English chronicle, "Agatho and 125 bishops sent to England by Wilfrid, Archbishop of York."

But, as was noted under the *life* of Vitalian, full reliance cannot be placed on these details in connection with Medehampstede, as they are only to be found in the twelfth century *Peterborough* MS. of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

St. Wilfrid of York.

What brought Wilfrid to Rome in the days of Pope Agatho will now be ours to set forth as clearly as may be, but shortly, as the career of this glorious Englishman

[1] *A.-S. Chron., ib.* Wilfrid himself procured from Agatho various privileges for his own monasteries of Ripon and Hexham. (*Cf.* Eddii, *Vit. Wilf.*, c. 47, 51.) And at the request of Erconwald, Bishop of London, the Pope is said to have given the right of electing the bishops of London to the monks of the monastery of St. Paul's, London (*Monast. Anglic.*, iii. 299). The latter of these privileges is, however, marked as corrupt and spurious in Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, iii. 161).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and servant of God belongs rather to the history of the Church in this country than to the *Lives of the Popes.* Besides, his heroic life, his long undaunted struggle in the cause of freedom, have been well written[1] of in books that are easily accessible to the English reader. But as Wilfrid came to Rome and the popes three times; and as, towards the close of his days, he "thought[2] of returning once again to that See of Peter whence he had received justice and freedom, to end his life there," he cannot be passed over in treating of the popes from Eugenius to John VI. Nor indeed should we care to leave unnoticed him whom that noble Frenchman, the Count de Montalembert, so great an admirer of our nation, in the warm glow of his beautiful and eloquent language,[3] calls "the eldest son of an invincible race, the first of the English nation"; the first of "that great line of prelates, by turns apostolic and political, eloquent and warlike, brave champions of Roman unity and ecclesiastical independence, magnanimous representatives of the rights

[1] Lingard, besides a brief notice of Wilfrid's actions in his *History of England* (i. pp. 69–71), has a full account of them in his *History of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (i. pp. 117–132). See also Butler's *Lives of the Saints* for Oct. 12; Faber in the Puseyite *Lives of the English Saints*; and best of all, Montalembert in his *Monks of the West*, IV., bk. xii. The ancient authorities for Wilfrid's 'life' are of the first importance. *Cf.* his 'life' by his friend Eddi Stephen (ap. Mabill., *Act. SS. O. S. B.*, iv., ed. Venice), and Bede, *H. E.*, iii. c. 25 *seq.* His 'life' was also written in poor Latin verse by Fridegode, an English Benedictine, in the tenth century, by order of St. Odo of Canterbury. *Cf.* Preface to vol. i. of the *Historians of the Church of York* (Chronicles and Memorials of G. Brit.), where these and other lives of St. Wilfrid are given together. Some authors rather distrust Eddi because he was so strong a partisan of Wilfrid; and, on the other hand, believe that Bede was not so well disposed to him; but for the latter idea there does not seem any well-founded reason. *Cf. English Hist. Rev.*, 1891, 535 f.

[2] Edd., c. 62. "Scitote cogitationem meam, ut S. Petri Ap. sedem iterum appellarem et viderem, unde *liberatus* fui frequenter."

[3] *Monks of the West*, iv. pp. 373, 368.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of conscience, the liberties of the soul . . . a line to which history presents no equal out of the Catholic Church of England; a lineage of saints, heroes, confessors and martyrs, which produced St. Dunstan, St. Lanfranc, St. Anselm, St. Thomas à Becket, Stephen Langton, St. Edmund the exile of Pontigny, and which ended in Reginald Pole." Would that in detailing in brief Wilfrid's splendid course we might be filled with the inspiring powers of expression of the illustrious author of the *Monks of the West!*

Of a noble Northumbrian family, born about 634, Wilfrid at the early age of fourteen joined himself to the monks of Lindisfarne or Holy Island. We have already seen, under the pontificate of Eugenius I., how his expanding mind led him to Rome to seek for truth at its source. Returned thence convinced of the importance of unity even in small matters, such as the shape of the tonsure to be worn by clerics, let alone in such graver questions as the time of celebrating Easter, and with his heart full of love for Rome and all its ways, he began at once to oppose the Roman to the Celtic customs. He was able to do this with the more effect that he was called to be the tutor of Alchfrid, the son of King Oswin or Oswy, the powerful sovereign of Northumbria. By his abilities,[1] his address, and the natural attractiveness of a handsome person, he soon obtained great influence, and succeeded in bringing about the famous assembly of Whitby (664), in which the 'Easter question' was settled for Northumbria. Naturally many of the defeated adherents of the traditions of Columba never forgot Wilfrid's share in their discomfiture at Whitby; and, acting on the

[1] Erat "pulcher aspectu, bonæ indolis." (Edd., c. 2); Bede, v. 19, where Bede, who was a contemporary and acquaintance of Wilfrid, has given us a sketch of his life, mainly from Eddius.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

proverb that all is fair in love and in war, never lost an opportunity of opposing him. On the death of Bishop Tuda, Wilfrid was elected[1] to succeed him as bishop of Northumbria. To be quite free from any taint of schism, nothing would suit Wilfrid but that he should go to France and get consecrated (665) by Agilbert, Bishop of Paris. But during his absence a reaction had set in; and King Oswy, gained over by the Celtic party, had one Ceadda or Chad consecrated bishop of York. On his return Wilfrid made no protest against this unkind and tyrannical act, but retired to the famous monastery of Roman observance he had founded at Ripon. "Thus the saint begins to be visible in his character."[2] But in the year 669 there came to England, as we have seen, sent by Pope Vitalian, the heroic old Greek Theodore to be its metropolitan. And the old man, who was afterwards to do so much wrong to Wilfrid, began his ever-memorable pontificate in our island by restoring Wilfrid to the bishopric of York,[3] with the consent of Oswy, who yielded to the apostolic commission. After this, till the death of the great *Bretwalda* (670), Wilfrid was again in full favour with Oswy, and for some years with his son and successor Egfrid. Wilfrid was, however, destined again to remember that "faith was not to be put in princes." The dislike which Egfrid had begun to entertain for Wilfrid, on account of an intricate and delicate cause, with which this

[1] "Consenserunt reges et omnis populus huic electioni, et S. Wilfritho presbytero omnis conventus in nomine Domini accipere gradum episcopalem præcepit." Edd., c. 11–13. The kings were wishful for one "qui voluisset sedis apostolicæ disciplinam sibi facere," *ib.* In the first instance, Alchfrid had given Wilfrid lands, "finding him to be a Catholic," and because he had himself "always followed and loved the Catholic rules of the Church." Bede, v. 19.

[2] Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iv. p. 189.

[3] "Veniens ad regem . . . . statuta *judicia* apostolicæ sedis, unde emissus venerat, secum deportans." Edd., c. 15.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

work[1] has nothing to do, was augmented by his (Egfrid's) second wife Ermenburga. Jealous of the wealth and influence of Wilfrid, this Jezabel, as the saint's biographer calls her,[2] contrived, by constantly harping on the one theme, to inspire her husband with the same base passion. The pair, in their resolve to degrade Wilfrid, had the art to engage Archbishop Theodore on their side. The archbishop had long been rightly convinced that one bishop for each of the eight Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was utterly inadequate to the spiritual needs of England.[3] Up to this time, however, he had done nothing in the matter. Now, gained over by Wilfrid's enemies, he greatly curtailed his jurisdiction (678); and out of his diocese formed three new ones, for each of which he consecrated[4] a bishop. Against this high-handed measure, which he denounced as 'mere robbery,' Wilfrid protested, and declared that he would appeal to the judgment of the Holy See[5]! To Rome accordingly Wilfrid journeyed; and there, after escaping many snares which his enemies had caused to be laid for him, he arrived in 679. There also arrived, with letters from Theodore, full of violent accusations against Wilfrid, a monk Coenwald.[6] To examine the affair thoroughly, Agatho summoned a council, in which some fifty bishops and priests took part,[7] and at which

Council at Rome, Oct. 679.

[1] *Cf.* Montalembert, *ib.*, iv. pp. 233–244.

[2] "Quasi impiissima Jezabel." Edd., c. 24.

[3] Bede, *H. E.*, iv. 5.

[4] "*Inordinate*, adds Eddi (c. 24), solus ordinavit." Bede, iv. 12.

[5] Edd., *ib.* "Tali judicio fraudabili non contentus, cum consilio co-episcoporum suorum, judicium Apostolicæ sedis magis elegit, sicut Paulus Ap. sine causa damnatus a Judæis, Cæsarem appellavit."

[6] *Cf.* Ep. Joan., iv., ap. Edd., c. 52, and ap. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, l. iii., ap. Migne, t. 179, p. 1568. *Cf. ib.*, p. 1558.

[7] *Ib.*, Edd., c. 29; Bede, v. 19. The complete acts of this Council have perished; but part of its work has been preserved for us by Eddi (c. 29), William of Malmesbury (*De Gest. Pont. Angl.*, iii., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 179, p. 1558), etc.; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 136. The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he presided in person. Feeling that the proceedings of the court that listened to the first appeal to Rome from England must be of special interest to Englishmen, we will give them, as far as our sources will allow us, at some length.

The council was held in the Lateran basilica, and was opened by the Pope himself. Then the bishops of Ostia and Portus arose, and, after laying down that the "regulating [1] of all the churches was in the hands of the Pope, who was in the place of Peter," and declaring that they had carefully read over the charges made against Wilfrid by Theodore and others, and Wilfrid's defence, found that he had not been canonically deposed, and, on the contrary, had evinced his moderation by keeping clear of broils and quietly appealing to the Apostolic See, in which Christ founded the primacy of the priesthood. At the command of the Pope, Wilfrid was brought before the assembly, and his (Wilfrid's) petition read before the synod. It begins: "I, Wilfrid, the humble and unworthy bishop of the English,[2] have come to this Apostolic eminence, as to a tower of strength. And I trust that I shall get justice, whence flows the rule of the sacred canons to all the Churches of Christ." The memorial then goes on to show how uncanonically its author had been treated, though no accusation is made against Archbishop Theodore,[3] "because he had been commissioned by the Apostolic See." In conclusion, Wilfrid declares that he

council given by these authors (p. 131 f.) as a separate council, I take to be only earlier sessions of the council spoken of in the text. It dealt with the needs of the Church in England in general.

[1] "Omnium quippe ecclesiarum ordinatio in vestræ apostolicæ auctoritatis pendet arbitrio, qui vicem b. Petri apostoli geritis," *ib.*, c. 29, ed. "Master of the Rolls" as usual.

[2] *Saxoniæ.* Edd., c. 30.

[3] "Quem (Theodorum) quidem, eo quod ab hac Apostolicæ summitatis sede directus est, accusare non audeo," *ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

will abide absolutely by the decision of the Holy See; "to the equity of which[1] he has come with fullest confidence." Full of admiration at the spirit that animated Wilfrid, the Pope and the synod decreed that he should be restored, that the bishops who had replaced him should be expelled; but that the archbishop should ordain as coadjutors to Wilfrid, such men as the saint thought proper to select himself in a synod assembled for that purpose. All bishops and princes alike were commanded to obey this decree, under pain of different penalties. Various other decrees were also passed at this synod for the better governing of the Church in England.[2] We can well understand that Wilfrid made no haste to return home. The journey to Rome was a very serious undertaking in those days, and there was much to be seen there, even at a time when the city was going to decay; and much to interest and astonish an enlightened man coming from this country. Wilfrid collected relics of the saints,[3] and purchased a large variety of things for decorating his churches on his return.

Present at the synod at Rome against the Monothelites. (680).

Wilfrid stayed long enough in Rome to be present at the synod of 125 bishops (March 27, 680), assembled by Pope Agatho (which will be spoken of presently), to select deputies to be sent to Constantinople to assist at a general council to be held against Monothelism. Wilfrid subscribed as "Bishop of York,[4] who had appealed to and had been absolved by the Apostolic See, and who, sitting as judge in synod with 125 other bishops, confessed by his signature the true and Catholic faith, in the name of all the

[1] "Ad cujus æquitatem, cum tota mentis confidentia properavi," *ib.* *Cf.* also pp. 134, 193, 232, vol. i., *Historians of the Church of York*, for accounts of this synod by Fridegode, Eadmer, etc.

[2] *Cf.* Haddan and Stubbs, *Conc.*, iii. 136 f. [3] Edd., c. 33.

[4] Ed., c. 53. "Wilfrithus . . . . Apostolicam sedem de sua causa appellans, et ab hac potestate . . . . absolutus," etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

northern parts of Britain, Ireland, and the islands inhabited by the Britons and the Angles, the Scots and the Picts."

By the order of the Pope, Wilfrid returned to England after this council, and humbly showed to Egfrid the decrees in his (Wilfrid's) favour.[1] But the king and his councillors, pretending that they had been bought,[2] had Wilfrid imprisoned. In vain the king tried to bribe Wilfrid into acknowledging that the Apostolic briefs were forged. But, full of trust in the authority of the Holy See, Wilfrid declared that he would sooner have his head struck from his body than make such a declaration.[3]

After some months' imprisonment, Wilfrid was released from prison, but banished the kingdom of Northumbria. After having been driven from one kingdom to another, he was engaged in improving his exile by labouring for the conversion of the pagan inhabitants of Sussex, when Archbishop Theodore, made to examine into his conduct by the consciousness of approaching death, realised that he had, in his treatment of Wilfrid, been false as well to him as to the authority of the Holy See.[4] He became perfectly reconciled to him, and procured for him from Aldfrid, the successor of Egfrid, the restoration of his See[5] (686).

But Wilfrid's old opponents, the upholders of the Celtic traditions, had only been scotched, not killed. They excited

[1] Edd., c. 33, 34.

[2] "Diffamaverunt . . . . ut pretio redempta essent scripta, quæ ad salutem observantium ab Apostolica sede destinata sunt" (*ib.*, c. 34).

[3] "Cum fiducia Apostolicæ auctoritatis, respondit prius se capite truncandum esse, quam id unquam confiteri velle" (*ib.*, c. 36).

[4] "Auctoritatem apostolicæ sedis, a qua missus est, metu agitante honorificans cum b. episcopo . . . . amicitiam . . . . inire . . . . non distulit" (*ib.*, c. 43).

[5] "Aldfrithus . . . . secundum Agathonis . . . . et sanctæ synodi judicium, propriam sedem episcopalem in Eboraca civitate . . . . reddidit" (*ib.*, c. 44).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

enmities between Wilfrid and the king; and after some years of bickering, Wilfrid[1] was again an exile (691). Archbishop Brithwald also, the successor of Theodore, turned on Wilfrid; and at a great council at Ouestræfelda (703), probably Austerfeld, a little village on the borders of Yorkshire and Notts, and near Edwinstow in Sherwood Forest, Wilfrid was required to resign his bishopric. But asking them how they dared to resist the decrees of Popes Agatho, Benedict and Sergius in his behalf, and pointing out what he had done for the Church of Northumbria during his forty years' episcopate, he again appealed to Rome.[2] Arrived in Rome, "as it were at his mother's breast,"[3] he was summoned before a synod presided over by Pope John VI. (704).[4] In seventy sessions the points in dispute between the envoys of Brithwald and Wilfrid were thoroughly sifted. Wilfrid urged that now for the third time had he come to Rome for help, and asked for a favourable hearing, as he had received verdicts in his behalf from Popes Agatho, Benedict and Sergius, and as the action of the Apostolic See was wont to be even and consistent.[5] In the course of the proceedings, the assembly learnt with amazement from the testimony of the oldest among them that the venerable septuagenarian in their midst was the same Wilfrid who twenty-four years previously had subscribed to the decrees of the Roman council against the Mono-

[1] "Postremo maxima flamma exardescente, de regione Ultra-Humbrensium sanctus homo Dei a rege Aldfritho expulsus, recessit" (Edd., c. 46).

[2] "Fiducialiter sedem appello Apostolicam" (*ib.*, c. 47).

[3] "Ad hanc gloriosissimam sedem, quasi ad matris gremium, confugimus" (*ib.*, c. 50).

[4] "Tunc Johannes papa, cum coepiscopis suis undique congregatis . . . . ad synodalem veniens, præsentato Wilfritho," etc. (*ib.*, c. 50); "Introductis quoque . . . . a Sancto Berthwaldo archiepiscopo . . . . viris directis ad Apostolicam sedem," *ib.*, c. 52.

[5] "Unitas apostolicorum virorum individua semper esse solet" (*ib.*, c. 51).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

thelites! With one voice the astonished multitude expressed their sorrow that one who had for over forty years been a bishop should be treated with the indignity that Wilfrid had been. Whereupon the Pope, having declared that in all the careful examinations they had made of the case, the synod had found no crime in Wilfrid, declared him absolved from the charges brought against him.[1]

He then put into Wilfrid's hands a letter[2] for Ethelred, King of the Mercians, and Aldfrid, King of Northumbria. He tells them how grieved the whole Church was at the discord in their midst, exhorts them to be obedient, points out the care with which the case had been gone into at Rome, and orders[3] Brithwald to summon a synod, to bring before it Wilfrid and the usurpers of his See, and to settle the difference between them. If that cannot be done, they are to be sent to Rome to be tried, under penalty, if any refuse to come, of being deposed and excommunicated. At the command of the synod, Wilfrid set out for England.[4] The archbishop and King Ethelred[5] promised obedience to the Pope's orders. But Aldfrid declared that what he and the archbishop 'sent from Rome' had decided, he would never, while he lived, change on account of what it had been thought fit to call the

[1] Edd., c. 53.

[2] Ap. Edd. c. 54, and Will. Malms., *De Gest. Pont.*, ap. Migne, t. 179, p. 1568.

[3] "Commonemus Berchualdum, præsulem S. Cantuariorum ecclesiæ, quem auctoritate principis App. archiepiscopum ibidem confirmavimus, ut synodum convocet," *ib.* It may be noted in passing, that whence Brithwald received his authority is stated by Eddius, not only in the above quotation, but also in c. 53, where he is spoken of as: "ab hac sede apostolica emissus"; and "ab hujus apostolicæ sedis monarchia directus."

[4] Edd., c. 55.

[5] Ethelred, with the greatest humility, declared "Hujus Apostolicæ auctoritatis scriptis, ne unius quidem literæ apicem unquam in vita mea condemnabo," *ib.*, c. 57.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

decrees[1] of the Apostolic See! But, quietly adds the biographer, from whose spirited pen we have all these most interesting details: "Afterwards he completely changed his decision, and was truly sorry for his conduct." Taken suddenly ill, he confessed the sin he had been guilty of against Wilfrid and the Apostolic See,[2] but died before he could make reparation (705). Eadwulf, the successor of Aldfrid, was even more violent than Aldfrid, but his reign was limited to a duration of two months; and under his successor Osred, the dying wishes of his (Osred's) father Aldfrid were carried out.

Brithwald summoned the synod (705) the Pope had ordered to meet, at the village of Nidd, on the river of the same name,[3] south of Ripon. In the presence of the bishops, of the king, and his nobles, the decrees of the Pope were read and explained. The bishops, after some consultation, became reconciled with Wilfrid, and his two great monasteries of Ripon and Hexham were restored to him; and he was restored to the See of Hexham. "And thus he lived[4] in peace four years, *i.e.*, until the day of his death" (709).

In this sketch of the life of St. Wilfrid, there is one fact that cannot fail to impress itself on the reader. In the histories which have come down to us of the struggle for liberty on the part of the people in the earlier days of the countries of Europe, Rome and the popes are always to be seen as most useful and trustworthy allies of its champions. The history of St. Wilfrid gives us a striking instance of this truth. In his long contest for his rights

[1] "Quod nos cum archiepiscopo ab Apostolica sede emisso . . . . judicavimus, hoc quamdiu vixero, propter Apostolicæ sedis (ut dicitis) scripta, nunquam volo mutare. Et hanc sententiam plene postmodum mutavit, et vere pœnituit eum" (Edd., c. 58).

[2] *Ib.*, c. 59.

[3] *Ib.*, c. 60.

[4] Bede, *H. E.*, v. 19. *Cf.* v. c. 3, and Edd., c. 60.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as a bishop, Wilfrid was really fighting for the rights of every citizen against the arbitrary tyranny of kings. He was doing battle for that personal freedom we English value so highly; and his allies were the popes of Rome. With their power behind him, he finally triumphed over despotism; and in his victory the nation shared. Especially did they reap its fruits in the freedom he won for the episcopacy. "Thanks to him,[1] until the Norman Conquest, four centuries later, no English king dared arbitrarily depose a bishop from his See." In a bid for liberty, what chance have the people, when the king has the clergy at his beck? Is it not hence strange to find freedom-loving Englishmen railing against men like St. Dunstan and St. Thomas à Becket? It is due to the heroic resistance of such men against would-be absolutism that we are the free nation that we are to-day!

But we must return to Pope Agatho and the principal event in his reign—the Sixth General Council. Victor over the Caliph[2] Muaviah (or Moawyah) (678), and at peace with the Avars, thus causing "a universal[3] state of security both in East and West," Constantine determined[4] to try and bring about the same universal peace in the Church. He accordingly wrote (August 12, 678) a letter,[5] already several times quoted, to Pope Donus, "Archbishop of Old Rome and Universal Pope." It was

[1] Montalembert, *Monks*, etc., iv. p. 364.

[2] Theophanes in *Chron.*, ad an. 671; Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire*, bk. v., c. 9.

[3] *Ib.*, vol. ii. 313.

[4] Finlay, *History of Greece*, vol. i. p. 381, who thinks his 'superior orthodoxy' to be the one only noteworthy point about Constantine Pogonatus, still calls him "an intelligent and just prince, who, though he did not possess the stubborn determination and talents of his father, was destitute also of his violent passions and imprudent character."

[5] *Hist. Conc.*, ed. Labbe, vi., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87, p. 1147. Héfélé, v. p. 138, Eng. ed. "Tempus non recipit perfectam congregationem fieri."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

received[1] by Agatho, and begins by observing that the Pope knows that he (the emperor) has been often asked to have a discussion on the question in dispute between the two Sees of Rome and Constantinople. He has never agreed, because partial discussion only made matters worse, and the times had hitherto been unfavourable for the holding of a general council. As, therefore, the times will not permit the summoning of a general council to end the unfortunate discussion, the emperor begs the Pope to send learned men, furnished with the needful books, and with full powers to speak in the name of the Pope and his council (*συνόδου*), in order to confer with the patriarch of Constantinople, and Macarius, patriarch of Antioch; and by the grace of the Holy Spirit to agree upon the truth. The emperor will show no favour to either party, but will receive the papal legates with fitting honour. He suggests that the Pope might send as deputies three clerics[2] to represent the Roman Church, and some twelve bishops and metropolitans, with four monks from each of the four Greek monasteries in Rome, to represent the rest of his patriarchate. The letter concludes with the assurance that the emperor has ordered the exarch Theodore to do

[1] *L. P.* "Hic suscepit jussionem . . . . missam Dono papæ, invitantem . . . . ut debeat . . . . missos suos dirigere in regiam urbem pro adunatione facienda," etc. In some letter, in connection with the calling of this general council, addressed to the Pope, and of which Pope Gregory II. has preserved us a fragment in his first letter to the emperor Leo, Constantine declared that he would not attempt to sit or speak as emperor among the bishops, but simply act as one of themselves, and carry out what they decided upon. "Neque cum illis tamquam Imperator sedebo, aut imperiose loquar . . . . et prout statuerint Pontifices, ego exequar" (Latin version).

[2] "Ex vestra sancta Ecclesia (si utique videtur ei) tres personæ sufficiant; quod si et plures, quantæ ei placuerunt, dirigat," *ib.* The word 'synod,' which often occurs in this letter, simply means 'province.'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

everything for the safety and convenience of those who should be sent to Constantinople.

Agatho orders the holding of synods in the West, preliminary to the General Council to be held in Constantinople.

Agatho at once fell in with these views of the emperor; and to give the greater weight to the words of those who were to be his legates at Constantinople, he ordered synods to be held in the different countries of the West, so that his deputies would speak with its united voice. We know of synods being, in consequence, held at Milan,[1] and at Heathfield[2] in England. And in Rome there met together in synod 125 bishops, in the Easter week of 680.[3] After this assembly broke up, the priests Theodore and George, and the deacon John, who was afterwards to be Pope (John V.), representing the Pope, and three bishops, to speak for the whole West, set out for Constantinople[4] bearing two long letters for the emperor, one[5] from Pope Agatho himself, and the other from the bishops of the Roman synod.

In his letter to Constantine, Agatho says he would have sent the deputies before, but had been prevented, not only by his own illness, but chiefly by the time he had had to wait for the assembling of the bishops from the more distant parts of his patriarchate. The deputies he is now sending are not to be estimated by their scientific attainments. For how,[6] asks the Pope, can

[1] *Cf.* synodal letter, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87, p. 1261 : Mansi, etc.

[2] Bede, *H. E.*, iv. c. 17, 18. *Vide sup.*, p. 25.

[3] *Cf.* Vit. S. Wilfrid, c. 53. It is from this source alone that we know any of the details of this synod.

[4] Bede, *De sex ætat.*, sub. an. 688; *L. P.*; ep. 1, Agath.; and ep. Constant. ad Georgium Constant.

[5] These letters are to be found in Migne, t. 87, pp. 1161 and 1215; and in Mansi, t. xi., and Hardouin, t. iii., etc. *Cf.* Héfélé, v. 142 *seq.*

[6] We subjoin the original of this passage, as it is the one constantly quoted to show the decay of learning even in the Eternal City. No doubt something must be allowed to the 'modesty' of the Pope; but on the other hand the prolixity of this very letter, and the length and complexity of many of its sentences, show, at any rate, the absence of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

men who have to live in the midst of enemies and who have to earn their daily bread by the labour of their hands, find time for acquiring learning? Still they would be found men well able to hand on inviolate the deposit of faith they had received from their ancestors in the faith. He then lays down the doctrine of the two wills and operations, as he has received it from[1] his predecessors. This, he adds, is the true belief of Christianity, taught not by human wit but by the Holy Ghost through the princes of the apostles. This is the confession of him who was pronounced 'blessed,' in that he received his revelation from heaven, and of him to whom the Redeemer of Mankind thrice committed His sheep and under whose guidance this Church has *never* swerved from *the way of truth in any particular*—this Church, whose authority, as that of the prince of all the apostles, the whole Catholic Church and all the œcumenical councils have ever embraced and followed, and whom heretics have on the contrary ever attacked with falsehood and hatred. The rule of the true faith, the Apostolic Church will preserve perfect to the end in accordance with the prayer of Our Lord (St. Luke xxii. 31, 32) that Peter's faith might not fail.

Hence, continues the Pope, when the patriarchs of Constantinople endeavoured to introduce heretical novelties

polish in the learning of the time. "Apud homines in medio gentium positos, et de labore corporis quotidianum victum cum summa hæsitatione conquirentes, quomodo ad plenum poterit inveniri Scripturarum scientia?"

[1] "Quam percepimus per apostolicam apostolicorumque pontificum traditionem. . . . Hæc est Christianæ religionis vera atque immaculata professio, quam non humana adinvenit versutia, sed Spiritus S. per app. principes docuit." . . . Hæc est ejus confessio "cujus annitente præsidio, hæc apostolica ejus Ecclesia numquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est." This Agatho insists on several times in the course of this letter, whence we may infer, parenthetically, that he knew that Pope Honorius had not fallen into Monothelism.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

into Christ's unspotted Church, my predecessors never ceased exhorting them to desist from their errors, at least by keeping silence (*saltem tacendo*, a clear allusion to the attitude of Pope Honorius towards Sergius). Agatho then proceeds to enlarge upon the 'two natural wills and operations,' adducing in support of his explanation testimonies from the writings of the Greek Fathers. He shows how Sergius and his heretical successors varied even in their errors, from which the Church must be withdrawn and all must 'with us' confess the truth founded on the firm rock[1] of that Peter who preserves his Church from error. In conclusion, the Pope earnestly begs the emperor to see that all be allowed freedom of speech at the forthcoming council.

The synodal letter, signed by the Pope and the 125 bishops present at the council, is quite to the same effect, insisting just as strongly and repeatedly on the infallibility of the See of Peter. The bearers of these letters reached Constantinople on September 10, 680, and were honourably received[2] by the emperor, who, the very same day, addressed a mandate[3] to the patriarch George, in which he gave his sanction to his summoning to Constantinople the bishops subject to his jurisdiction, for the purpose of discussing the question of the 'wills' in Our Lord. George was also informed that the emperor had given the same sanction to Macarius of Antioch.

In consequence of this energetic action on the part of the emperor, the Sixth Œcumenical Council was opened

Sixth General Council, Nov. 7, 680–Sep. 16, 681.

[1] "Quæ (b. Petri App. principis Ecclesia) ejus gratia atque præsidio ab omni errore illibata permanet."

[2] *L. P.*; Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 688.

[3] *Conc.* "Sancimus congregare vestram paternam beatitudinem omnes, qui ad ejus sanctissimam sedem pertinent, ... episcopos in hanc regiam urbem." On the Sixth General Council, read Héfélé, § 312 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

November 7, 680. Theophanes[1] assures us that 289 bishops and 'fathers' took part in it, but the minutes of the council only give us forty-three bishops as present at the first session, and 174 at the last. The council was held[2] in a hall of the imperial palace, known by the name 'Trullus,' from being furnished with a cupola or dome.

The proceedings were opened by the Papal legates[3]; and they signed first the minutes of the last session. The emperor was present in person at many of the sessions.

The Fathers, in council assembled, pronounced that the Monothelites had forged various documents; decreed the restoration of the name of Pope Vitalian to the diptychs; condemned and declared degraded Macarius of Antioch for his obstinate adhesion to Monothelism; anathematised, in their thirteenth session, Sergius, Cyrus of Alexandria and the other Eastern leaders of Monothelism, and moreover Honorius, who was formerly Pope[4] of Old Rome; and in their eighteenth and closing session (September 16, 681) issued their decree relative to the two wills in Our Lord. The Fathers of the council, after declaring that they received with full trust (πιστῶς, *fideliter*), and greeted with

[1] Ad ann. 671–2, in *Chron.*; Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 688, gives 150 bishops, as does the *L. P.*

[2] *L. P.*; and the Acts of the Council. In the biography (*L. P.*) of Agatho, a summary of the doings of many sessions of the Sixth Council will be found, only *more or less* accurate.

[3] According even to Photius (*Mystagogia*, ap. Migne, *P. G. L.*, cii. p. 367): "Though not present in body Agatho summoned the sixth synod, and by his doctrine and ardent zeal was its ornament!" *Cf.* also the *Liber Diurnus*, which gives (form. 84, ed. Sickel) 175 as the number of bishops present at the council; and brings out the position of the emperor (eo presidente) and the Pope at the council—"cui Agatho papa per legatos suos et responsales prefuit." *Cf.* form. 85, "in qua (sexta synodo) et apostolicæ sedis legatos presidere manifestum est."

[4] "Cum his vero simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia simulque anathematizari prævidimus et Honorium . . . . eo quod invenimus per scripta, quæ ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus ejus mentem secutus est, impia dogmata confirmavit" (Actio 13).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

uplifted hands the letter of Pope Agatho to the emperor, and the synodal letter of the bishops assembled under him, and that they followed the five preceding general councils, unfolded at length, and with great perspicuity, the Catholic doctrine of the two wills and energies in Our Lord.

At the close of the synod a letter was presented to the emperor, in which the bishops inform him that, inspired[1] by the Holy Ghost, in full agreement with one another, and following the dogmatic letter of their most holy father Agatho, and that of the synod held by him, they declare the two wills in Christ, and that they condemn Sergius, etc., and Honorius, as he followed them (*utpote qui eos in his secutus est*). They point out that the zeal of the Pope or the synod is not to be blamed, as they were merely acting on the defensive, and that in their behalf fought[2] the prince of the apostles, inasmuch as his imitator and successor is their supporter, and in his letter explained to them the divine mysteries. Peter spoke through Agatho.

A letter was also despatched to Pope Agatho, "the wise physician granted by Our Lord to banish disease from the Church and to restore health to its members." To him, as to the bishop[3] of the first See in the universal Church (*ut primæ sedis antistiti, ὡς πρωτοθρόνῳ*), and as standing on the firm rock of faith, the fathers of the council leave what has to be done. In accordance[4] with the sentence

[1] "Proinde inspiratione S. Spiritus conspirantes, et ad invicem omnes consonantes atque consentientes, et Agathonis sanctissimi patris nostri et summi Papæ dogmaticis litteris . . . . consentientes, necnon et suggestioni sanctæ, quæ sub eo est synodi 125 Patrum, concordantes," etc., ap. Mansi, xi. 658; Hardouin, iii.

[2] "Nobiscum concertabat App. princeps; illius enim imitatorem, et sedis successorem habuimus fautorem, et divini sacramenti mysterium illustrantem per litteras . . . . et per Agathonem Petrus loquebatur," *ib.*

[3] "Tibi, ut primæ sedis antistiti universalis Ecclesiæ, quid gerendum sit relinquimus, stanti super firmam fidei petram," ap. Mansi, xi. 683.

[4] "Ex sententia per sacras vestras litteras de iis prius lata," *ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

previously passed upon them in the Pope's letters, they had anathematised the heretics, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, etc., and, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and with the Pope's instructions to guide them (*ταῖς ὑμετέραις διδασκαλίαις ὁδηγούμενοι*), had proclaimed the doctrine of the two wills. And as with the Pope they have shed abroad the light of the orthodox faith, they beg him to confirm their action in writing.[1]

The emperor, on his side, issued an edict[2] enjoining all, whether cleric or lay, under pain of punishment to accept the decrees of the council. And with the returning papal legates, he also sent a letter to Pope Leo II., as word had reached Constantinople, before the Roman legates left it, that Pope Agatho had died (January 10, 681). Leo was informed of what had been done by the council, and of the contumaciousness and subsequent deposition of Macarius and others, who refused[3] to receive the letters of Pope Agatho, thus flying in the face, as it were, of Peter, the leader and prince. However, as Macarius and his supporters had all in writing begged him (Constantine) to send them to the Pope, he has done so, and leaves their case in the Pope's hands.

Leo in his reply (after September 682) confirmed the decrees of the Sixth General Council, and, as we shall see in

[1] "Quam (orthodoxæ fidei lucem) ut iterum per honorabilia vestra rescripta confirmetis, vestram oramus paternam sanctitatem," Ap. Mansi, etc.

[2] *Ib.*

[3] "Renuit omnino sacratissimis Agathonis litteris assentiri, veluti in ipsum coryphæum ac principem Petrum insaniens." The emperor has a little joke against Macarius; he informs the Pope that Macarius, despite his name (which in Greek means *happy*), was not *blessed*!

"Omnes (Macarius, etc.) scriptis precibus Serenitatem nostram communiter precati sunt, ut eos ad vestram beatitudinem mitteremus. Sic igitur fecimus . . . . vestro judicio omnem ipsorum causam permittentes." Ep. ap. Mansi, etc. What confidence in the justice and clemency of Rome does not this appeal of Macarius show!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his *life*, notified them to the West. In his letter of confirmation to the emperor, Leo said that as the acts of the council were in agreement[1] with the faith of Pope Agatho and his synod, he therefore assented to what had been defined, and by the authority of Blessed Peter confirmed its decrees and received it as he did the five preceding general councils. Leo proceeded to condemn Theodore, Cyrus, and the other Monothelite leaders, and Honorius, who, by his teaching (*doctrina*) obscured the Apostolic See, and by a profane surrender would have overthrown the immaculate faith (*profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est*); or, following the Greek version, permitted the spotless to be stained.

With regard to Macarius and his followers, the Pope had up till then not been able to effect much.[2]

The definitions of the Sixth General Council were practically the death-knell of Monothelism. The names of the heretical patriarchs from Sergius to Peter were removed from[3] the diptychs, and their portraits from wherever they were to be found either in the churches or in the public places. Deprived of State support, and receiving no encouragement from the higher clergy, Monothelism soon 'died the death'; for its attempted revival by the Emperor Philippicus partook of the ephemeral nature of the reign of that prince.

[1] "Sancta universalis et magna sexta synodus . . . . apostolicam in omnibus regulam et probabilium patrum doctrinam secuta est, et quia definitionem rectæ fidei plenissime prædicavit, quam et apostolica sedes b. Petri Ap. (cujus licet impares ministerio fungimur), veneranter suscepit, idcirco et nos, et per nostrum officium hæc veneranda sedes apostolica concorditer et unanimiter his, quæ definita sunt ab ea consentit, et beati Petri auctoritate confirmat," etc. (Ep. Leo, ap. Mansi, xi., etc.).

[2] *Cf. L. P.* in vit. S. Leonis II. From that source we learn that, on the feast of S. Theophania (Jan. 6, 683), Leo received back again into Catholic communion two of those who had been sent to him. The rest, with whom he could do nothing, were shut up in different monasteries.

[3] *L. P.*, § 12.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

What caused the emperors' proposed 'conference' to become an œcumenical council is not known. Perhaps it was because it was found that deputies from all the five great patriarchal Sees had arrived in Constantinople, and it was felt that the decisions of a general council would put an end to the 'one-will' heresy at once.

Decree regarding papal elections, 680.

The Pope's legates at Constantinople were successful in their mission not only from a doctrinal, but also from a temporal point of view. They induced Constantine to lessen the tax the popes had to pay at their ordination—an impost first levied by the Gothic kings. He also did away with the delegated power by which the exarchs of Ravenna had confirmed the papal elections, again reserving that right to the emperors.[1] He even waived that right later on. It must not be forgotten, however, that, as already noticed, the exact meaning of this decree is not established. Those who believe that papal confirmation by the exarch did not begin till the time of John V. (685), hold that this decree of Constantine simply proclaims that, while he remitted the money payment for the imperial ratification, he made it clear that he only did so on the understanding that there was to be no alteration in the ancient custom of seeking for imperial assent to the election.

Theodore of Ravenna submits to Pope Agatho, 680.

In the history of the intermittent struggle of the Archbishops of Ravenna for increased independence,[2] we read that Theodore (677–691) followed in the footsteps of his immediate predecessor (Reparatus), submitted[3] to the

[1] *L. P.*, § 13. "Hic suscepit divalem jussionem secundum suam postulationem, ut suggessit, per quam revelata est quantitas qui solita erat dari pro ordinatione pontificis facienda; sic tamen ut si contigerit post ejus transitum electionem fieri, non debeat ordinari qui electus fuerit, nisi prius decretus generalis introducatur in regia urbe, secundum antiquam consuetudinem, et cum eorum scientiam et jussionem debeat ordinatio provenire."

[2] *Vide supra*, p. 11 f.

[3] *L. P.* "Hujus (Agathonis) temporibus Theodorus archiepiscopus

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Pope Agatho, and assisted at the Roman council of 680. We are assured by Agnellus, the episcopal historian of his predecessors in the See of Ravenna, that Theodore made an arrangement with Pope Leo II. (682), that the archbishops of Ravenna were not to be obliged to stay in Rome more than eight days at the time of their consecration, nor to come to Rome themselves afterwards, but were each year to send one of their priests to do homage to the Pope. However, it was during the same pontificate that Constantine Pogonatus decreed[1] the restoring of the Church of Ravenna to subjection to the See of Rome, and that the archbishop elect should, in accordance with ancient custom, go to Rome to be ordained. And the Pope himself decreed that the anniversary of Maurus, the first rebellious archbishop of Ravenna, should not be observed. For a time we shall hear no more, after St. Leo II., of the autonomy of Ravenna.[2]

Death of Agatho, 681.

The *Book of the Popes*, after telling us that Agatho[3] gave a large sum for lights for the church 'of the apostles' and St. Mary Major, adds that he was buried in St. Peter's, January 10, 681. A fearsome[4] plague had devastated Rome during the summer of 680, and it is possible that Agatho may have died from its effects, direct or indirect. He is depicted on a painting (which Gregorovius assigns to the fifteenth

Ravennæ semetipsum sedi apostolicæ post multorum annorum curricula præsentavit." *Cf.* Agnell. in vit. Theod., c. 4, ap. Muratori, *R. I. S.*, II. ii.; and *cf.* Murat., *Annal.*, vi. 368 *seq.*

[1] *L. P.* in vit. S. Leo. II.

[2] See, however, under Pope Constantine, etc.

[3] Jaffé (*Regest. Pontif.*) quotes an interesting decree of Agatho's, addressed to all bishops, to the effect that "all the decrees of the Apostolic See were to be received as confirmed by the voice of Blessed Peter himself." "Sic omnes apostolicæ sedis sanctiones accipiendæ sunt, tanquam ipsius d. Petri voce firmatæ sint." This fragment is to be found in the 'decrees' of Ivo and Gratian.

[4] "Qualis nec temporibus aliorum pontificum fuisse memoratur" (*L. P.*).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

century) on the walls of St. Peter 'ad Vincula,' as taking part in a procession for the cessation of the pestilence.[1] His epitaph, commonplace enough, ran as follows:

Pontificalis apex virtutum pondere fultus
Ut jubar irradiat, personat ut tonitrus.
Quæ monet hoc peragit, doctrinæ fomes et auctor;
Format enim gestis quos docet eloquiis.
Dum simul æquiparet virtus et culmen honoris,
Officium decorat moribus, arte gerit.
Præditus his meritis antistes summus Agatho
Sedis apostolicæ fœdera firma tenet.
En pietas, en prisca fides! insignia patrum
Intemerata manent nisibus, alme, tuis.
Quis vero dinumeret morum documenta tuarum,
Formula virtutum dum tua vita foret?[2]

[1] Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, ii. 167–8; Ciampini, *Vet. Monument.*, p. ii., c. 17, p. 116.

[2] Ap. Grisar, *Analect.*, i. 126; Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 358.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. LEO II.

A.D. 682-683.

Sources.—The *L. P.* Some half dozen letters in connection with the Sixth Council.

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine Pogonatus, 668–685.	Perctarit (second time), 672–688.	Theodore, 677–687.

Election and consecration of Leo.

St. Leo II., like his predecessor, a Sicilian by birth, and the son[1] of a certain Paul, though elected, according to custom, soon after the death of Agatho, was not consecrated till August 17, 682, an interval of 584 days. Probably the business of the Sixth General Council and the negotiations carried on by the papal legates to obtain freedom from imperial *confirmation* were the causes of the emperor not confirming the election in good time.

His character and learning.

The *Book of the Popes* has bestowed a very beautiful character on this Pontiff. It depicts him as a man of great eloquence, as possessed of a good knowledge of the Scriptures, as well versed in Greek and Latin,[2] and in the theory and practice of music. Not only was he learned

[1] *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.* "Græca, Latinaque lingua eruditus, cantilena ac psalmodia præcipuus," etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

himself, but he was an earnest teacher of others, and he was at once a preacher and a doer of good works. For he was a lover of poverty and the poor. In a word, he was both pious and hard working. The fact that Leo is praised for his knowledge of Greek is a further proof not only that it was no longer the common possession of 'society' in Rome, as it was in the days of Rome's power, but that individual knowledge of it was becoming rare in the West. The barbarians on the one hand, and religious differences on the other, were rapidly severing the last bonds that united the Latin-speaking portion of the empire with the Greek. We have already seen different popes complaining of the difficulty of getting Greek documents translated. The time was approaching when almost all knowledge of it was to be lost in the West.

The Pope confirms the Sixth General Council.

On his election, Leo wrote[1] to the emperor, probably to notify his election and to ask the imperial confirmation. As we saw under Pope Agatho, Constantine wrote[2] to the Pope—his letter is dated December 13, 681—and sent him, along with the letter, his approval (dated December 23, 681) of the Sixth General Council. The legates of the Pope Agatho, who were to be the bearers of these letters to his successor, would seem to have spent the winter at Constantinople. At any rate they did not reach Rome till July 682. After his consecration,[3] in the following

[1] This fact is to be gathered from the end of Constantine's letter to the Pope.

[2] Ep. ap. Mansi, xi., etc. Héfélé, Eng. ed., v. 179.

[3] The *L. P.* tells us that the third consecrating bishop of the Pope was the Bishop of Velitræ, as Albano had no bishop at the time. The other two consecrators were the bishops of Portus and Ostia. "The Bishop of Ostia placed the Gospels on the neck, and laid his hands on the head of the Pontiff elect, the Bishop of Albano began the first prayer (*Adesto supplicationibus nostris*), and the Bishop of Portus the second prayer (*Propitiare Domine*)," says Gregorovius (*Rome in the Middle Ages*, Eng. trans., ii. p. 173 note), following the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

month, Leo sent off[1] to the emperor his confirmation of the decrees of the Sixth Œcumenical Council before the end of the year 682. He then took steps to have the decrees of the council published throughout the West, and there are still extant[2] four of his letters which he sent into Spain by the notary Peter. One was addressed to the Spanish bishops in general, another to Bishop Quiricus, one again to King Ervig (though some MSS. ascribe this letter to Benedict II.), and another to Count Simplicius.

Sends its decrees to Spain.

These four letters are practically all to the same effect. Leo knows that those to whom he is writing are anxious about the purity of the faith, for which the apostolic See, the mother of all the churches,[3] has ever toiled, and for which it would be ready to suffer the last extremities rather than see it defiled. He then tells of the doings of the council at Constantinople, at which there were bishops from all the world,[4] what was defined and who were condemned. He explains most carefully that Honorius was condemned for not at once extinguishing the flames of heresy, as became his apostolical authority, but for rather fanning them by carelessness.[5] He sends the 'definitions' of the council and one or two of the letters in connection with the council; that is, such portions of the acts as had up to that time been translated into Latin. In his letter

old 'ordos' in Mabillon, etc. It may be observed that practically the same is done at the consecration of any bishop at the present day. *Cf. Pontificale Romanum* and *sup.*

[1] *Cf. sup.* 46. [2] Ap. Mansi, xi., etc.

[3] "Pro qua (Christiana religione) hæc sancta Ecclesiarum omnium mater apostolica sedes usque ad victimam desudavit semper et desudat . . . ." (Ep. ad Epp. Hisp.)

[4] "Episcopis ex totius mundi partibus aggregatis," *ib.*

[5] "Qui (Honorius) flammam hæretici dogmatis, non ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit sed negligendo confovit," *ib.*; and his letter to King Ervig: "Qui (Honorius) immaculatam apostolicæ traditionis regulam, quam a prædecessoribus suis accepit, maculari consensit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to the bishops he exhorts them to subscribe the decrees of the synod.

The result of these letters was the fourteenth council[1] of Toledo, which met in November 684, and which heartily accepted the faith of the Sixth Œcumenical Council.

Leo and the Church of Ravenna.

Mention has already[2] been made of how Leo obtained from Constantine the revocation of the decree of Constans II., making the bishops of Ravenna 'autocephalous.'

Leo as a church-builder.

Before speaking of the Pope's death, mention has now only to be made of the fact that he dedicated (February 22, 683) to St. Paul a church, which he built near that of St. Bibiana, and in which he placed the relics of many martyrs. He also built,[3] near the 'velum aureum,' a church which he dedicated to SS. Sebastian and George—the Church of St. George in Velabro, a church of great interest to Englishmen, as it was the titular church of the late venerated Cardinal Newman. It is close to the arch of Janus Quadrifrons and the Cloaca Maxima. "The building of Leo II. (the entrance hall is of later date) still preserves its original outlines, and is a small basilica of three naves, with sixteen ancient granite or marble columns. Scarcely any other church within the city is so pervaded by the atmosphere of early Christian times. The original form of the church—that of a basilica—its simplicity, its sculptures, its inscriptions, some of them in Greek, dating from the first centuries of Christianity, its air of spell-bound tranquillity, its situation in the valley between the Capitol and the Palatine, hallowed by so many historic associations, com-

[1] Mansi, xi. Héfélé, *Hist. of the Councils*, v. p. 215, Eng. trans.

[2] *Sup.*, p. 47. The Pope on his side, by a decree, still preserved in the archives of the Roman Church in the days of 'Anastasius,' abolished the money payment that used to be made when the archbishops of Ravenna received the pall. *L. P.*

[3] *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

bine to form a powerful impression on the mind of the beholder."[1]

Leo was buried in St. Peter's, July 3, 683. According to Butler,[2] he is commemorated as a saint in the Roman and other martyrologies on the 28th of June. For on that day his body was translated (688) into the church proper of St. Peter.[3] Death of Leo, 683.

[1] Gregorovius, ii. pp. 171–2.

[2] *Lives of the Saints*, vi. 343. *Cf.* Acta SS. Boll., 28 Jun., v. p. 375.

[3] Jaffé, *sub. an.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. BENEDICT II.

A.D. 684–685.

Source.—The 'life' in the *L. P.*

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine Pogonatus, 668–685.	Perctarit (second time), 672–688.	Theodore, 677–687.

Consecration of Benedict, 684.

AFTER another long interval — over eleven months — Benedict II., a Roman, the son of one John, was consecrated June 26, 684. He had served the Church from his infancy, and both as a youth and a priest, says his biographer,[1] had shown himself worthy of his name.

His character.

For in him abounded the grace of heavenly 'benediction.' Like his predecessor he was skilled in the sacred Scriptures and in music. He was also a lover of poverty, humble and gentle, patient and generous. What matter for regret that the pontiffs of this period, with the charming characters which history has handed them down as possessing, should have reigned for such short periods, and that the records of their deeds should occupy such little space in the world's history!

[1] *L. P.* "Se sic . . . exhibuit, ut decet virum suo nomine dignum, in quo vere supernæ benedictionis gratia redundavit."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The publication of the election of Benedict II.

Mention has already been made of the formalities which preceded the consecration of a pope in the days when imperial confirmation, direct or indirect, through the exarch, had to be awaited before the consecration could take place. The formulas used for the despatch of the necessary business in connection with the affair were given at the same time.

The 'liberation' decree of Constantine the Bearded necessitated the drawing up of fresh formulas. It was, of course, necessary to send information to the emperor as to the result of the papal elections, even if his consent to the papal consecration had now no longer to be asked. Hence in the *Liber Diurnus* we find another set of *forms* (82–85) in connection with the election of a new pope. In the construction of the new *forms* the old ones were not unnaturally brought into requisition. Consequently many portions of the new productions are like the old ones. There is, however, this important difference between the two sets. There is no request for confirmation in the new *forms*. Many of the phrases of these new forms point to the conclusion that they were drawn up for Benedict II. The Sixth General Council (681) is alluded to as recently (*nuper*) over; and Constantine (IV.) the Bearded (†September 685) is still spoken of in them as alive. We may suppose that these formulas were in use to proclaim the election of the new pope till the compact of 817 between the Papacy and the new empire in the West.

The first of the formulas (82) is described as *Decretum Pontificis*. It is the decree of election which, duly signed by *N.*, humble priest of the Holy Roman Church, and all the clergy, nobility and soldiery (or honourable citizens), was deposited in the archives[1] of the Lateran. After

[1] "Hoc decretum . . . . in arcivo domine nostræ sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, scilicet in sacro Lateranensi scrinio . . . . recondi fecimus," f. 82.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a preamble about the goodness of God in turning their sorrow for the death of their late pastor into joy for the new one He has given them, the decree records how, after long prayers for heavenly guidance, all met together, and, on account of his merits, unanimously elected the deacon (Benedict).

Before his consecration the new Pope-elect made a public profession of faith—*Indiculum Pontificis*, formula 83. He declared that even to death would he guard the faith given by Jesus Christ, and handed down to him by the successors of St. Peter. He professed his adhesion to the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, and the other doctrines of God's Church, as they have been unfolded (*commendata*) by the œcumenical councils, the constitutions of the popes, and the writings of the approved fathers (*probatissimorum doctorum*) of the Church. With the other general councils he acknowledged the sixth, lately (*nuper*) called together by his predecessor Agatho, under the Emperor Constantine 'of pious memory.'[1] Particularly would he stand by the decrees of his predecessors; preserve the discipline, rites and goods of the Church, and never alter the *tradition* he had received from those who had gone before him. The profession was signed with his own hand by the Pope-elect.

When consecrated, the new Pope announced (form. 84) his accession "to the whole people of God, his most reverend brethren and most well-beloved children." He would beg the prayers of all to assist his unworthiness, would guard the faith (which is professed at considerable length), and condemn those whom the councils had condemned, viz., Sergius, Paul, etc., "along with Honorius, who

[1] This phrase shows that Constantine IV. was then dead; and so that in this form this particular formula could not have been used at Benedict's election.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

gave encouragement to their profane doctrines." A copy of this public profession of his faith, also signed by the Pope's own hand, was deposited in the *confession* of St. Peter.

The last of the formulas in question (85) takes the form of a homily addressed by the Pope to the faithful assembled in St. Peter's on the day of his consecration. After an exhortation to Christian peace, it concludes with a profession of faith, like those of the preceding formulas, and with prayers for the prosperity of the empire.

Benedict and the faith of 'Spain.'

As no Spanish bishops had been present at the Roman council under Pope Agatho, we saw how earnest Pope St. Leo II. was to inform them of the definitions of the Sixth General Council, and to secure their adhesion to them. St. Benedict followed in his footsteps, and one of his first acts, though only "a priest, and in God's name the elect[1] of the Holy See," was to send a letter[2] to the notary Peter, urging him to fulfil to the best of his ability the commands of St. Leo, "and procure with all zeal the subscriptions of the bishops to the decisions of the Council." Whether or not in consequence of greater activity on Peter's part, King Ervig summoned[3] the fourteenth council of Toledo

[1] From this letter and from his decrees in behalf of St. Wilfrid (ap. Eddius), it is plain that the government of the Church was now in the hands of the Pope 'elect,' during the *vacancy* of the Holy See, and not, as before, in the hands of the archpriest, etc. (see above, Pt. I. 354). In the *absence* of the Pope, the Roman Church continued to be governed by the 'three,' the archpriest, etc., till the days of Pope Zachary. *Cf.* Cenni, Diss. V., ap. Zaccaria, *Raccolt. di Diss.*, t. xviii. We may account for decrees running in the name of 'Benedict elect,' by supposing they were issued after the reception of Constantine's edict of privilege, and before his consecration; and that previous to Benedict's reception of Constantine's charter of exemption from imperial confirmation, the Church was governed as before by the 'triumvirate'; or perhaps, what is simpler, the emperor's consent—never known to have been refused—was taken for granted.

[2] Ap. Mansi, xi., 1085, etc.

[3] *Cf.* the Acts of the Council, ap. Mansi, etc. Héfélé, v. 215, Eng.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(November 684). The council discussed the business for which, in accordance with the papal letters, they had been assembled. Monothelism was condemned. St. Julian, the Archbishop of Toledo, who presided at the council, drew up in its name and sent to the Pope an 'Apology' of their faith (*Liber Responsionis fidei nostræ seu*[1] *Apologia*). It was sent to Rome by the notary Peter, and consisted of four parts.[2] The document itself is now lost. Benedict was not satisfied with some of the phrases used by the Spanish bishops in their 'Apology.' He did not care for the expression: "will begot will," or that there were "three substances in Christ," and he accordingly sent back the 'Apology' for revision.[3] At another council of Toledo (the fifteenth), at which both bishops and nobles took part, and which met May 11, 688, the Spanish bishops defended the expressions the Pope had complained of. They explained them in an orthodox sense, and urged that similar phrases were used

trans. "Nos . . . . causæ hujus ordinem, et totius rei negotia retexentes, quibus Romanæ sedis fueramus literis invitati," etc.

[1] This document is alluded to in the fourth canon of the fourteenth council. That it was written by St. Julian is known from his 'life' by Felix, fl. 693, Bishop of Toledo (Ap. Bolland. *A. SS.* ad diem Mart. 8). *Cf.* also the acts of the fifteenth council discussing this document.

[2] *Cf.* acts of the fifteenth council of Toledo. Héfélé, v. 217 *seq.*

[3] *Cf. De rebus Hisp.*, iii. 13, of Roderic Ximenes, who was Archbishop of Toledo from 1208–1245. The archbishop is not accurate in making Benedict receive the second apology of St. Julian. *Cf.* the acts of the fifteenth council, from which it is clear that Benedict was dead when that council met. "Ad illa nos illico convertimus contuenda capitula, pro quibus muniendis ante hoc biennium (?) *beatæ memoriæ* Romanus papa Benedictus nos literarum suarum significatione monuerat." As the fifteenth council of Toledo, which uses these words, was held in 688, and Pope Benedict II. died in 685, the word 'biennium' presents a chronological difficulty that seems to have escaped the notice of Héfélé and other writers. It may be supposed that we should read 'triennium' or 'quadriennium' for 'biennium.'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by the fathers. And, nettled apparently at being considered heterodox even in language, they concluded their defence of their first 'Apology' with the tart remark that they would not dispute with any who chose to dissent from their doctrine, founded as it was on that of the fathers; and that if their doctrine seemed objectionable to ignorant rivals, it would seem, they *modestly* add, 'sublime' to lovers of truth! However, St. Julian drew up a second Apology and sent it to Rome in charge of some very learned men. This was accepted as orthodox by Pope Sergius.[1]

This Pope seems to have had as good an understanding with Constantine the Bearded as his predecessors. He

Obtains full freedom (?) for the consecration of the Popes, 684.

[1] *Cf.* Roderic, *ubi sup.*, where at the close we should read Sergius for Benedictus. As some writers see in every act of disrespect or rebellion against the Holy See, not merely an isolated act of disobedience but an indication of complete independence of the authority of Rome, it is to the point to repeat that at this period the whole West acknowledged the spiritual supremacy and jurisdiction of the Bishops of Rome. With regard to Spain in particular sufficient has already been said of its relations towards the Popes to make it obvious that it was no exception to the rule. We will, however, add one more voice to the chorus we have already heard speaking of the spiritual position of Spain. It is an authoritative one, and uttered on a solemn occasion. It is the voice of Spain's king; and it was spoken when trying to convert another Teutonic ruler, the Lombard Adalwald, from Arianism. To him wrote, in language more lengthy and, at times, more fervent than clear, the Visigothic monarch Sisebut (†620). He explained to his would-be convert that his faith must be founded on the rock against which the winds and rains of error will break in vain; and that, in consequence of the words of Our Lord—S. Mat. xvi. 18, no one can be held blameless unless he maintain the apostolic profession in its entirety. He then told him that that profession was the one which the *Roman Church* had received from the Apostles and gave to those who rightly sought it. "Clare lucideque permonuit (doctor gentium), unam ad cultum venerationis esse confessionem credentium, quam sequax ecclesia ab apostolis traditam Romana suscepit et recte petentibus, hereticorum segitibus extirpatis, maternis effectibus tradidit" (Ep. Sis. ap. *M. G. Epp.* iii. 674). This was the belief of the Visigoths till their national extinction!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

obtained [1] a decree from that just prince that the Pope-elect might be consecrated at once, without having to wait for any imperial confirmation.

It has already been noted that the question with regard to the confirmation of papal elections by emperor or exarch is a most complicated one. The meaning of this decree of 684 or 5 is, as previously stated, disputed.[2] According to some, in doing away with confirmation by the emperor it substituted that by the exarch, while others contend that by it all necessity of applying to any secular authority for confirmation was abrogated. Certainly that is the more obvious meaning of the decree, and is the one maintained by those who hold that the exarch had confirmed papal elections before the year 684. The supporters of this view, however, have further to suppose either that this decree was modified almost immediately after its publication, or that, when in the *Book of the Popes* there is mention in the life of Conon (687) of a *customary* deputation to the exarch after Conon's election, it is only meant that thereby official notice of the accession of the new Pope was given to the imperial government. While, therefore, it is clear that the decree of Constantine effected some change in the existing custom as to imperial confirmation of papal elections, the reader must decide for himself what he supposes that custom to have been.

Whether we consider the princes who arrogate to themselves this right of confirming the election of the popes or the candidates for the sacred office of supreme pastor of Christendom, it must be confessed that, generally speaking,

[1] "Hic suscepit divales jussiones clementissimi Constantini magni principis ad venerabilem clerum et populum, atque felicissimum exercitum Romanæ civitatis, per quas concessit, ut persona qui electus fuerit ad sedem Apost. e vestigio absque tarditate ordinetur." *L. P.*

[2] *Vide sup.*, Pt. I. p. 40 n.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the interference of the secular power in these elections can only be fraught with evil; and this, if only on the general principle of the detrimental effect produced on any business or corporate body when outside influence can be brought to bear unduly on its concerns or deliberations. The door is at once opened to bribery and corruption of all sorts. Certainly the history of the Church has proved this abundantly. When secular influence in the papal elections has been greatest, the rulers of the Church have been the most indifferent. The Papacy was never at a lower ebb than it was in the tenth century, and the interference of the powerful in papal affairs never greater.

The Emperor's sons made the adopted children of the Pope, 684.

Constantine gave the Pope another proof of his regard for him. He would have the Pope adopt his two sons, Justinian and Heraclius. This he effected by sending locks of their hair (*mallones*)[1] to the Pope, who received them in State accompanied by the clergy and the 'army,' *i.e.*, the commanders of the army. In the early Middle Ages,[2] it was the custom that those who first cut the hair of children, or to whom such first-cut tresses were sent, adopted the said children. Muratori[3] thinks that this act would also signify the submission and obedience which kings professed towards the successors of St. Peter, after the manner of slaves, whose hair used to be cut. And he quotes the famous Anastasius,[4] who tells of a king of the Bulgarians, in his devotion to the Holy See, with his own hand cutting off his hair and handing it to the legates of the Pope, saying: "Know ye, nobles and people of Bulgaria,

[1] *L. P.* in vit.; Muratori (*Annal.*, ad an. 684) notes that the word 'malloni' is still in use in the Modenese dialect.

[2] *Cf.* Paul. Diac., vi. 53.

[3] *Annal.*, ad an. 684.

[4] Præfat. ad *Concil.*, viii., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 20. "Omnes primates et cuncti populi Bulgarorum terræ cognoscant, ab hodierno die me servum fore post Deum b. Petri et ejus vicarii."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that from this day forth I am the servant, after God, of Blessed Peter and his vicar!"

Macarius, ex-bishop of Antioch, 685.

It may be remembered that Pope St. Leo II. failed to make any impression on Macarius of Antioch and his heterodox views. On the death of Theophanes (685?), who was appointed to fill the See of Antioch in place of Macarius, Benedict made an effort to induce the heretical bishop to subscribe to the orthodox faith, with a view of having him restored to his See. For forty days the Pope caused Macarius[1] to be visited by one of his special advisers (*consiliarius*). But Macarius died, as he had lived, in obstinate heresy.

Favours for the clergy.

A brief list of this Pope's church restorations may be read in the *Liber Pontificalis*. He was very good to the clergy. The *Book of the Popes* notes three classes who received the last dying gifts of the Pope, viz., the various orders of the secular clergy, the monasteries which were deaconries (*monasteria diaconiæ*), and the *mansionarii* or lay sacristans. From the letters of Gregory the Great,[2] it is clear that there were deaconries not only in Rome but in other cities as well, and that their object was to distribute corn and other necessaries of life to the needy and to look after the poor generally. Evidently some at least of the deaconries were monasteries, and some of them were presided over by monks. The one who presided over the deaconry was known as its *dispensator*; and so the recent (1900–1) excavations in the forum have brought to light an inscription of one Theodotus, *primicerius defensorum*, and *dispensator* of the deaconry of St. Maria Antiqua. Whether or not there was at this period more than one deaconry to each

[1] Act. i., *Conc. Gen.*, vii., ap Mansi, etc.; Migne, *ib.*, p. 227.

[2] V. 25 (28); x. 8 (21); xi. 17 (27); xiii. 23 (19). "Fertur . . . . quod *annonas atque consuetudines diaconiæ* . . . . eminentia vestra substraxerit," x. 8; "Te Johannem religiosum . . . . mensis pauperum et exhibendæ diaconiæ elegimus præponendum," xi. 17.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

region is not known. Under Hadrian I. (772–795) two more were added to the sixteen he found already in existence, scattered, in irregular proportion, throughout the different regions.

Death of Benedict II.

After then, in accordance with custom, bestowing various favours on the clergy on Easter Day, March 26, of 685, he fell ill,[1] and died a short time after. He was buried (May 8, 685)[2] in St. Peter's.

His epitaph ran as follows (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 365).

Magna tuis, Benedicte pater, monumenta relinquis
Virtutum titulos, O decus atque dolor!
Fulguris in specimen mentis splendore coruscas
Plura sed exiguo tempore cœpta fluunt.
Cuncta sacerdotum præstantia munia comples
Et quo quisque bono claruit unus habes.
Quippe quod a parvo meritis radiantibus auctus
Jure patrum solium pontificale foves.
Non hoc ambitio rapti tibi præstat honoris
Indolis est fructus quam comitatur honos.
Et quia sollerter Christi regis agmina pastor
Percipe salvati præmia celsa gregis.

The *jure patrum* would seem to imply that it was after passing regularly through the various degrees of the clerical state that he at length reached the rank of supreme pontiff.

[1] The custom of bestowing money on the clergy on Easter morn, which is known to have been practised by St. Gregory I. (in vit Joan. Diac., ii. 25), was continued, at least, till the thirteenth century.

[2] *Cf.* Acta SS. Boll. 7 Mai, vol. ii. 197—the day on which he is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN V.

A.D. 685–686.

Source.—The *L. P.* is practically our only authority for the short life of this Pope.

Emperors of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine Pogonatus, 668–685 (Sept.). Justinian II. (Rhinotmetus), 685–695.	Perctarit, 672–688.	Theodore, 677–687.

Election and consecration, July 685.

NOTHING very important marks the reign of John, the Syrian, of the province of Antioch, the son of Cyriacus. As a deacon[1] he was one of those who represented the See of Rome at the Sixth General Council. Elected some time between May and the close of July, he was consecrated (July 23, 685) by the bishops of the same three Sees that consecrated his predecessor—viz., Portus, Ostia and *Velitræ*. We may suppose for the same reason, viz., the vacancy of the See of Albano. In his election there was, as the *Liber Pontificalis* expressly informs us, a reversion

[1] *L. P.* "Hic . . . . repræsentans locum apostolicæ sedis in sancta synodo," etc. "Vir valde strenuus, atque scientia præditus, et omnino moderatus." John must also have been very generous, for the *L. P.* assures us that he gave 1900 solidi to the clergy, monasteries, and mansionarii, or those who looked after the churches.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to the earlier mode of proceeding in the matter of electing the popes. Elected[1] by the people 'at large' in the Church of St. John Lateran, John was thence taken to the adjoining palace and enthroned *at once*, without having to wait for any imperial confirmation. This, of course, in virtue of the decree of Constantine just obtained by Benedict II., though, as we have seen, not a few authors of repute hold that his election had been confirmed by the exarch in the emperor's stead.

[1] John V. is the first Pope of the Middle Ages the method of whose election is mentioned in the *L. P.* As a help to the student to form his own conclusions as to the manner of electing popes in the Middle Ages, we will bring together the scant notices in the *L. P.* from John V. to Leo III. inclusive.

John V.—"A generalitate in Ecclesia Salvatoris electus est."

Conon.—"Sacerdotes et clerus unanimiter elegerunt (Cononem). E vestigio autem omnes judices una cum Primatibus exercitus pariter ad ejus salutationem venientes, in ejus laude omnes simul acclamaverunt. (Demum) videns exercitus unanimitatem cleri, populique, et ipsi consenserunt in persona prædicti viri." (An important passage.)

Sergius I.—"Primates judicum, et exercitus Romanæ militiæ vel cleri plurima pars et præsertim sacerdotum atque civium multitudo . . . . in personam Sergii concordantes se contulerunt."

Gregory III.—"Quem (Greg.) viri Romani seu omnes populi elegerunt."

Stephen II.—"Stephanum . . . . cunctus populus sibi elegit, et intra Lateranense patriarchium misit."

Stephen III.—"Cunctus Dei populus . . . . congregatus est intra basilicam S. Die Genitricis ad Præsepe. Ubi et omnes misericordiam Dei petentes (Stephanum) sibi eligunt. Quem omnes cum laudis præconiis in basilicam Salvatoris, deportaverunt, et exinde intus venerunt et in Patriarchium juxta morem intromiserunt." (Another important passage.)

St. Paul I.—"Plurima pars judicum et populi . . . . quoniam (pars) validior et fortior erat (Paulum) elegerunt."

Stephen IV.—"Christophorus . . . . aggregans 'in tribus Fatis' sacerdotes ac primates cleri, et optimates militiæ atque universum exercitum et cives honestos, omnisque populi Romani cœtum . . . . (Stephanum) elegerunt. Quem et cum vocibus acclamationum in Lateranense deportaverunt patriarchium."

Leo III.—"A cunctis sacerdotibus seu proceribus et omni clero, necnon et optimatibus, vel cuncto populo Romano, (Leo) electus est."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

John V. is set down by his biographer as a man of great energy and learning, but withal as a very moderate man. This last exceptional good quality may account, to some extent at any rate, for the success of John's dealings with the Emperor Constantine. His biographer attributes to his exertions, while at Constantinople, the obtaining of imperial rescripts from Constantine, by which the taxes that had to be paid by the 'patrimonies' of the Church in Sicily and Calabria, and other imposts that weighed very heavily on the See of Rome, were reduced.

The Church of Sardinia.

The step of the greatest moment taken by this Pope, at least so far as history has recorded his doings, was his action in bringing back the Church of Sardinia to his direct jurisdiction. This direct jurisdiction the popes had handed over, at least to some extent,[1] to the archiepiscopal See of Cagliari. Pope Martin I. had, however, to withdraw this concession, as it was being abused. Notwithstanding this, Citonatus, the Archbishop of Cagliari, without asking any permission of the Pope, calmly consecrated Novellus for the See of Torres (Turris Libisonis, now Porto di Torre). To this insolence the Pope replied by summoning a council, and by a special bull, which in the days of the Pope's biographer was still to be found in the archives of the Roman Church, placed Novellus under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See.[2]

Death of Pope John, Aug. 686.

After a long illness, and so severe a one that he could

[1] For it appears from the letters of St. Gregory I. (xiii. 21, al. x. 17) that the bishops of Sardinia had to come to Rome to be consecrated. Speaking of the election of two bishops—one to this very See of Turris, in the south of the island near Sassari—he writes: "Qui dum fuerint postulati, cum sollemnitate decreti omnium subscriptionibus roborati . . . . ad nos *sacrandi* occurant."

[2] The *L. P.* is our authority for all this. "Antiquitus ordinatio fuit sedis apostolicæ, et ad tempus concessa fuerat ipsa ordinatio eidem Ecclesiæ (Caralitanæ)."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

scarce perform the customary ordinations, Pope John died in 686, and was buried in St. Peter's (August 2).

From the short reigns of the popes of this period, we can only conclude that it must have been usual then to elect very old men. Indeed, the age of Conon and Severinus is especially mentioned, as are the great infirmities of Agatho, John, etc. And if there is any truth in the conjecture of some, that Pope Agatho was no other than the Agatho about whom Pope St. Gregory I. wrote to Urbicus, the abbot of the monastery of St. Hermes at Palermo, he must, as we have already noted, have been a centenarian when he became pope.

In John's epitaph, of which we quote a few lines, his position at the Sixth General Council as Agatho's legate is commemorated. Epitaph.

Hic et in extremis sollers fidusque minister
Claruit et primus jure levita fuit.
Missus ad imperium vice præsulis extitit auctor,
Hunc memorant synodus pontificisque tomus.

(Duchesne, *P. L.*, i. 367.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CONON.

A.D. 686–687.

Source.—The *L. P.*

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarchs of Ravenna.
Justinian II. (685–695, first time.) (705–711, second time.)	Perctarit, 672–688.	Theodore, 677–687. John Platyn,[1] 687–702.

Conon is elected after a division.

On the death of John V. there was disunion among the electors on the question of his successor. The clergy favoured the archpriest Peter, the army the priest Theodore. As the gates of the Lateran basilica were in the hands of the soldiers, the clergy had to meet outside that noble church. The leaders of the army held their assemblies in the curious circular church of St. Stephen, with its very striking, if not very beautiful, frescoes. After message after message had passed to no purpose between the two parties, the clergy at length, entering the Lateran palace, unanimously elected Conon. The grey hairs[2] and

[1] It is clear from the *L. P.* in vit. Conon. that John had succeeded Theodore before the death of Pope Conon.

[2] *L. P.* in vit. "In quo (Conone) vere aspectus angelicus, veneranda canities, sermo verus, provecta ætas, simplex animus, quieti mores, religiosa vita, qui se nunquam aliquando in causis, actibusque sæcularibus commiserat."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the angelic beauty of Conon, combined with the well-known beauty of his character—his candour, his simplicity, his piety, his freedom from secular concerns—produced a powerful impression. The judges and the military commanders at once recognised Conon, and offered the usual salutation and acclamation.[1] Some think that Conon was a soldier's son, and that this had some weight in the eyes of the military. They suppose that the remark of 'Anastasius,' that Conon was "oriundus ex patre Thraceseo," does not mean that he was born in Thrace, or that his father's name was Thraceseus, but that he was a son of an officer of the Thracesian troop.[2] Wherever he was born, Conon had been educated in Sicily. He afterwards came to Rome and was ordained priest.

When the rank and file of the army saw the unanimity of the clergy and their own leaders, they also acknowledged Conon after a delay of a few days. Then, in conjunction with the 'clergy and people,' they sent off to the exarch Theodore notice of the election of Conon 'according to custom.'[3]

As to the meaning of these words of the *Book of the Popes*, enough has already been said. It may therefore suffice to remind the reader that those who believe that Constantine Pogonatus gave absolute freedom of choice to the electors of the popes think that this notice in the life of Conon merely signifies that official documents were sent to the exarch, as the emperor's representative, to let him know who the new pope was. The opponents of this view maintain, on the contrary, that the documents

[1] "Judices unacum Primatibus exercitus ad ejus salutationem venientes, in ejus laude omnes acclamaverunt" (*L. P.* in vit.).

[2] *Cf.* Duchesne's edit. of the *Liber Pontif.*; and Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vi. p. 351 note.

[3] "Missos una cum clericis, et ex populo ad excellentissimum Theodorum exarchum, ut mos est (exercitus) direxerunt." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

were sent to seek for the exarch's confirmation of the election. Certain it is, at any rate, that the interval between the election and consecration of a pope now becomes uniformly shorter than before, and that Conon was consecrated October 21, 686.

The electors of the popes at this period.

Mention has already been made of the mode of electing the popes from the third to the ninth century, and of those who had the right of election. It was then stated that throughout those ages the right of electing the popes lay with the clergy and people. However, as at this period there is frequent mention of the 'army' as a sort of third electing body, it will be convenient here to add a few more remarks on the same subjects. We are of opinion that the distinction between the 'army' and the 'people,' at the period of which we are now treating, is more apparent than real. Just as in the days of the Roman republic, the 'people,' except the youths and old men, were the 'army.' During the 'Decline' of the empire the Roman 'people,' by the wholesale introduction of conquered nations into the forces of the empire, and the disinclination of 'Roman citizens' to serve in the army, became a class quite separate from an army composed, for the most part, of foreigners. Hence in the first centuries the popes were said to be elected by the clergy and people. After the 'Fall' of the empire, the inhabitants of Rome—Romans we cannot now call them—had to look to themselves for protection against enemies from without. The emperors at Constantinople were unable to send troops for the protection of the old capital of the Roman empire. Consequently the 'people' of Rome had again to become soldiers, and by the close of the seventh century it would seem that 'the people,' 'the citizens' (*honesti cives*) were completely organised; and, with the universal

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

exception of youths and old men, were all soldiers, were the 'army.' Hence in the *Liber Pontificalis* mention is made sometimes (generally indeed from the close of the seventh century) of the 'clergy,[1] army and people,' and sometimes of the 'clergy and army.' After what has been said as a proviso, it may be correct to speak of the 'three electoral bodies'[2] that took part in papal elections in the earlier Middle Ages. From all this, it may be concluded with Mabillon,[3] that the order of electing and consecrating the popes before the eleventh century was as follows. First they were elected by the clergy; then followed the salutation and acclamation of

[1] *Cf. L. P.* in vit. S. Bened. II., where Constantine's decree about the elections of the popes is addressed to the 'clergy, people and army' on the one hand; and where, on the other, only the 'clergy and army' are spoken of as receiving the 'locks of hair' of the emperors' sons. And so the *Liber Diurnus*, f. 61, speaks of the "viros honestos cives, et de exercitali gradu," and says that the "clerus, optimates et milites seu cives" sign the act of election, where 'seu' means *and*, and 'optimates' marks out the nobler citizens. And in the life of Pope Valentine (A.D. 827), mention is only made of the clergy and the people with their more distinguished representatives. "Collectis igitur in unum . . . . episcopis, et . . . . proceribus, omnique . . . . populo" (*L. P.*). Later on in the same life, Valentine is said to have been elected by the people, and 'both branches of the military service,' viz., spiritual and temporal. "Almæ plebis et lætis utriusque militiæ Romanorum electus est vocibus."

[2] Where in the *Liber Diurnus* the election of the popes in the seventh century is described, the different classes mentioned as taking part in it may be reduced to three, viz., the clergy, the army, and the people, viz., the old and young; for the other classes mentioned are only subdivisions of these three. "Convenientibus nobis (i) cunctis sacerdotibus ac proceribus ecclesiæ et universo clero, atque (ii) optimatibus et universa militari præsentia, seu civibus honestis, et (iii) cuncta generalitate populi." *Cf.* Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, ii. 176–178. The 'proceres,' or 'primates' cleri, were the officials of the papal court, such as the Primicerius and Secundicerius of the Notaries, the treasurer, etc. (*Cf.* Cenni, Diss. V., ap. Zaccaria, *Raccolta di Diss.*, t. xviii.).

[3] *Comment. in Ord. Rom.*, § 18, ap. Pagi, *Brev. Gest. P. R.*, in vit. Conon.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the judges and nobles, the consent of the army, and, in fine, before the decree of Constantine IV., the subscription of all to the notice of the election, which was sent to the emperor (or, for a time, to the exarch) for confirmation. When the election was confirmed, the Pope-elect was consecrated in the basilica of St. Peter's on the Vatican, and enthroned in the Lateran basilica. In some cases, however, the enthronisation preceded the consecration.

Justinian II. and the Acts of the Sixth General Council.

This Pope received an imperial rescript of Justinian II., writes 'Anastasius,' in which the emperor says that he has recovered the acts, *i.e.*, the original copies, of the Sixth General Council. This letter is still extant[1] in a poor, scarcely intelligible Latin translation, and was addressed to Pope John V., though dated February 17, 687, a circumstance which may be used to show once again how slowly at times news travelled to Constantinople. "We have learnt," runs the rescript, "that the acts (viz., the original copies) of the Sixth Œcumenical Synod have been sent back to some of our 'Judges' (*judices*) who had lent them. We had not indeed imagined that anyone would be bold enough to keep possession of them, without our consent, for God, of His abundant mercy, has made us the guardians of the immaculate faith of Christ." The rescript adds that the emperor summoned together the patriarchs, the papal apocrisiarius, the metropolitans and bishops who were staying in the city, the senate, and various State officials and officers of the various army corps, stationed in different parts of the empire. Then he (the emperor)[2]

[1] Ap. Mansi, xi., etc.

[2] "Jussimus præfatas synodalium gestorum chartas in medium adduci, et coram supradictis omnibus lectionem eorum fieri, omnesque diligenter audientes signare ipsas fecimus" (Ep. Just. ad Joan. V.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

caused the copies of the council to be read before them, and then caused all to sign them. The documents were then handed over to the emperor's care, that "it might never be in the power of those who do not fear God, to corrupt or change them." This decree had been sent to the Pope, that he might know what was being done.

This imperial letter is particularly interesting as showing the great care taken by the ancients to preserve intact the decrees of the general councils.

Justinian remits dues from 'patrimony' of the Roman See.

It would almost seem as if, for a time at least, some of his father's good feeling for the Roman See must have found its way into the rude breast of Justinian. For, by two decrees,[1] he remitted two hundred measures (*capita*) of corn which the 'rectors' (*custodes*) of the 'patrimony' in Bruttium and Lucania had to pay every year; and he ordered the serfs belonging to the same patrimony (*familia patrimonii*) and of Sicily, and who were held in pledge by the military, to be restored. Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 370) observes that this patrimony is not expressly mentioned in the letters of St. Gregory I. But it is clear from several of them (Ep. ii. 3 (1); v. 9; ix. 129, 134, 110 (47, 48, 60), etc.) that the notary Peter and the sub-deacon Sabinus, who are spoken of in these letters, or to whom they were actually addressed, were evidently 'rectors' of a 'patrimony' in those parts.

Conon makes an unfortunate appointment.

Age, it appears, does not always bring that experience and prudence which is looked for from it. And so we read in 'Anastasius' of the aged Conon neglecting to follow the safe custom[2] of taking advice of the clergy; being deceived by designing men; appointing, in spite of the opposition of his counsellors, a certain Constantine, a deacon of the

[1] *L. P.*

[2] "Hic (Conon) ultra consuetudinem, absque consensu cleri," etc. . . . "hominem perversum et tergiversutum." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

church of Syracuse, as 'rector' of the important 'patrimony' of Sicily, and granting him an exceptional privilege, viz., the use of the coveted 'mappulum' (horse trappings or cloth) for riding. But it was not long before this 'sly and wicked man' got into trouble. His extortions raised seditions, and the governor of the province had to step in and send Constantine to prison. "So dangerous is it," moralises Pagi,[1] "for popes and bishops, without taking counsel, to promote to ecclesiastical offices and dignities men who have not been sufficiently tried!"

Conon sends St. Kilian to preach in Franconia.

If Conon got no glory from the deacon Constantine, the same cannot be said of his connection with St. Kilian and his companions. At the time when Conon mounted the Throne of the Fisherman, most of Germany was still pagan, especially in the North. Round about the Rhine, through the action of the Franks, who had accepted Christianity in the course of the preceding century, there were Christians, as there were, too, in the countries Helvetia, Noricum, Rhœtia, south of the Danube—the remains of the Christian churches which were there when the frontier of the Roman empire was the Danube itself. And no doubt in other parts of Germany there were Christians also, but isolated, and in many cases infected with pagan superstitions or with the Arian heresy. But throughout the seventh century missionaries from the Franks, Irish, and Anglo-Saxons brought the faith of Christ to different parts of Germany, and, particularly in its southern half, undermined the power of paganism.

About the year 685 there arrived at Herbipolis, now Wurzburg on the Maine, in Franconia, a band of mission-

[1] *Brev. Gest. P. R.*, n. 7, in vit. Con. Baronius, following an inferior MS., and thereby leading Pagi and others astray, makes Conon consecrate Constantine as Bishop of Antioch! *Cf.* Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 687.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

aries, among whom were SS. Kilian and Colman, priests, and Totnan, a deacon. They were a division of that great company of missionaries who left Ireland in the century of the greatest glory of the Church in that country (the seventh), and overran the continent of Europe, spreading everywhere the hope-kindling faith of Christ. When the saint and his companions arrived in Franconia among the Eastern Franks, his biographer, who seems to have lived about the end of the ninth century, tells how Kilian was greatly struck by the beauty of the country and its inhabitants, but correspondingly saddened by the reflection that they were in the power of 'the old enemy.' "My brothers," said he, "you see how charming is this land, and how fair its people, in error though they are. If you think it well, let us do as we decided whilst at home! Let us go to Rome and visit the threshold (*limina*) of the Prince of the Apostles. Let us present ourselves before the Blessed Pope John; and then, with the advice and leave of the Apostolic See, let us return here and preach the faith." To this exhortation all agreed, and betook themselves to Rome to obtain the Pope's sanction that they might preach the Gospel with authority. Arrived in Rome, they found that John V., whom they had set out to see, was dead.[1]

[1] "Dedit illi a Deo et S. P. Principe App. licentiam et potestatem prædicandi et docendi." *Cf.* his 'Life.' "Eamus Romam, et præsentemus nos obtutibus B. P. Johannis; et si Domini voluntas sit, ab Apostolica sede accepta licentia . . . . prædicemus illis nomen D. N. J. Christi." The men who gave Europe its Christianity recognised that a 'mission' or leave was necessary before they could exercise the function of preaching. They knew they had to be *sent* by Our Lord through His vicar on earth. If *all* Christians who wished nowadays to preach the gospel to the heathen had first to obtain the sanction of the Pope, the scandals caused by the acts of so many so-called missionaries would be avoided. Two ancient lives of St. Kilian are printed ap. *Acta SS.*, 8 Jul., ii. p. 612 f. The first and shorter life, from which are the above quotations, dates from about the end of the ninth century; the second from the eleventh. *Cf.* Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, July 8.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

They were, however, most kindly received by the venerable Conon, who ordained Kilian bishop, without assigning him any particular See. Armed with the papal permission to preach and teach, back to Wurzburg returned this noble band, feeling strong in the mission that Christ's vicar had imparted to them. Great success attended their efforts, and the Duke of Franconia himself, Gosbert, was baptised. But when Geilana, whom Gosbert had taken to wife, though she was the widow of his deceased brother, learnt that Gosbert was preparing to dismiss her at the exhortation of the missionaries, she had them secretly slain in 689. But the work of conversion went steadily on under the son and successor of Gosbert, and in later times the descendants of Kilian's converts venerated his relics. For his biographer tells how his sacred remains were translated to an honourable place by the joint action of St. Boniface and Burchard, first bishop of Wurzburg, and at the command of Pope Zachary.

Death of Conon, 687.

After a long illness, which was so severe as almost to prevent him from holding the usual episcopal ordinations—a trial which is also related to have befallen his predecessor John V.—Conon died and was buried in St. Peter's, September 21 (22 according to Jaffé), 687. The donation to the clergy, which, to the same amount as his predecessor, Conon had set aside for them, we shall see, in the life of his successor, they never got.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. SERGIUS I.

A.D 687–701.

Sources.—A rather longer 'life' in the *L. P.* The exact details given therein clearly show a contemporary author. The various *Acts of the Councils*, and Héfélé, v. pp. 221–242 (Eng. trans.), for the Quinisext or Trullan Synod.

Bede, *H. E.*, l. v.; Eddius, etc., for notices of Sergius' dealings with this country.

Emperors of the East.	Kings of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Justinian II., 685–695 (first time).	Perctarit, 672–688.	John Platyn, 687–702.
Leontius, 695–698.	Cunincpert, 688–700.	
Tiberius III. (Apsimar), 698–705.	Aripert II., 700–712.	

Disturbed election of Sergius I.

AGAIN we have to chronicle election troubles. Men there will ever be whom the hope of 'thirty pieces of silver' will lure on to sell their friends, their country and their God. And, on the other hand, the temptation to offer bribe is much intensified by the known willingness of the person to be gained over to accept it. The subsequent conduct of the exarch John Platyn will show that he was a man with an 'itching palm.' All this the archdeacon Pascal understood well. While Conon was lying on his death-bed, Pascal sent off to the exarch to

Double election of Theodore and Pascal.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

promise him money, if he would secure his election as Conon's successor. Gold was bait enough for Platyn. Instructions were at once issued by him to the 'judges' he had appointed in Rome, to make order that Pascal should be the next Pope.[1] Through their efforts Pascal was accordingly elected by a certain section of the people. It would seem, however, that he was not the first candidate in the field. Whether Pascal's proceedings during Conon's lifetime had been discovered, and good men were anxious to thwart them, or simply because the party that had elected the archdeacon Theodore, before Conon's election, were faithful to him, and very wishful that he, now archpriest, should be Pope—at any rate, a party elected Theodore. From the fact that his party occupied the *interior* section of the Lateran palace, where were the Pope's private apartments, it may perchance be inferred that Theodore was first elected. Pascal held the 'exterior' portion[2] of the palace. To explain these terms 'interior and exterior,' we may cite the following from Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 377):—The Lateran palace was divided into two groups of buildings. The one to the west occupied more or less the site of the modern palace; the one to the east, beginning at the façade of St. John Lateran, extended to the existing 'Sancta Sanctorum.' On the north this latter range of buidings projected beyond the former; and on the north façade of this more easterly group, towards its north-west corner, was the grand entrance staircase. Now Theodore had 'the interior portion,' *i.e.*, the left of the

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Conon. "Paschalis . . . . scribit Joanni novo patricio et exarcho, promittens ei dationem si persona ejus ad pontificatum eligatur; qui statim mandat . . . . suis judicibus, quos Romæ ordinavit, et direxit ad disponendam civitatem ut . . . . (archidiaconus) eligatur."

[2] Partem exteriorem "ab oratorio S. Silvestri et basilica domus Juliæ, quæ super campum respicit, occupat" Paschalis. *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

grand staircase; Pascal, the right of the staircase, *i.e.*, the site of the modern palace, embracing the oratory of St. Silvester and the Julian basilica, and which abutted on the nave of the great Lateran basilica.

Election of Sergius.

To put an end to the deadlock produced by the obstinate refusal of both candidates to yield their pretensions, the least factious, and consequently more numerous[1] and sounder portion of the community, met together in the palace of the emperors (*ad sacrum palatium*), and, after much discussion, chose a third candidate in the person of the priest Sergius. They first took him into an oratory (that of St. Cesarius M.) in the imperial palace, and then by force established him in the Lateran palace. The archpriest Theodore at once submitted and did homage to Sergius; and Pascal was made to do likewise.[2] No sooner, however, was Pascal left to himself than he spared no promises of money to induce the exarch to come quickly and secretly to Rome. Quite unexpectedly, accordingly, Platyn arrived in Rome. So secretly did he come, that the usual procession, with crosses and standards, which went out of the city some distance to greet the exarch on his coming to Rome, was only able in this instance to get just outside the city by the time Platyn was upon it. And though he did not feel himself strong enough to set at naught the wishes of the people at large in their choice of Sergius, he insisted that the 100 lbs. of gold (about £4200), promised him by Pascal, should be paid by Sergius. It was to no purpose that Sergius declared that he had given no such undertaking, and that he had not the money to give. The exarch would have his bond. As a guarantee that the sum should be

[1] "Primates judicum, exercitus, cleri plurima pars, atquæ civium multitudo." *L. P.*

[2] "Theodorus . . . . se humiliavit . . . . (Sergium) salutavit; (Paschalis) coactus . . . . volens nolens S." (salutavit), *ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ultimately paid, Sergius offered to pledge the 'canthari' (*candelabra*) and crowns which for ages had hung before the altar and confession of St. Peter. In vain, Platyn would have his pound of flesh, no more or no less. And not until the money [1] was actually raised and paid over would the exarch permit Sergius to be consecrated (December 15, 687).

Miserable end of Pascal, 692.

Not long after, for certain magical practices,[2] Pascal was deprived of his archdeaconate, and shut up in a monastery, where he died impenitent in 692 or 693.

Character of Sergius.

The priest thus picked out like a brand from the burning to rule the Church of God was a Syrian of Antioch. His father, Tiberius, had apparently emigrated to Sicily, perhaps in consequence of the Mohammedan incursions; and Sergius was educated at Palermo. Coming to Rome he was received into the ranks of the Roman clergy by Pope Adeodatus. And, because he was zealous and clever at music, he was handed over[3] for training to the 'head cantor' (*priori cantorum*). At that time he must have reached man's estate, as he became Pope about sixteen years after his arrival from Sicily. And though the 'schola cantorum' was at this period reserved for youths in the *minor orders*, it is supposed that the phrase in the *Book of the Popes* just quoted means that Sergius was attached to that school. He was at length ordained priest (June 27, 683) by Leo II., for the 'title' (Church) of St. Susanna 'ad duas domos' on the Quirinal. Whilst a priest he was distinguished by his love for saying Mass in the catacombs.[4] For in this century pious interest

[1] *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.* "Paschalis ab officio archidiaconatus pro aliquibus incantationibus . . . . privatus est; . . . . post quinquennium impenitens defunctus est."

[3] *Ib.* "Priori cantorum pro doctrina est traditus." *Cf.* ep. 41 Paul. I. (ed. Gundlach).

[4] This paragraph from the *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in these cemeteries of the early Christians seems to have fallen off considerably.

Sergius and England. (i) Cædwalla (685-688).

Passing over his reception (688) of St. Julian's second apology on the orthodoxy of certain phrases used by the fourteenth council of Toledo,[1] we will review in succession his relations with this country. Some time in the latter half of 688, Cædwalla, 'the strong-armed,' the powerful king of the West Saxons, "quitted his rule for the sake of Our Lord and His everlasting kingdom," and went, the first of our royal pilgrims, to the successors of St. Peter, to Rome to be baptised 'in the church of the apostles.' His conversion was one of the results of the indefatigable exertions of St. Wilfrid. Arrived in Rome, he was baptised by the Pope, taking, 'at Father Sergius' word,' the name of Peter (April 10, 689). And while 'still in his white garments,' he fell ill and died (April 20); thereby having had fulfilled for him his wish of immediately passing to the joys of heaven in his baptismal innocence. We can only imagine the interest and joy with which Sergius looked on this barbarian prince, whom religion had changed so rapidly from a revengeful warrior into a gentle and tender follower of the crucified Lamb of God. The Pope ordered the remains of the royal convert to be buried in St. Peter's, and an epitaph to be placed over his tomb, so that men might be induced to be imitators of his virtue.[2]

[1] *V. sup.*, p. 57.

[2] *V.* Bede, *H. E.*, v. 7; *A.-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 688; and *De Gest. Lang.*, vi. 15. From the concluding part of the epitaph, given by Bede, it is clear that the date of Cædwalla's death was 689, and not 688, as the *A.-Sax. Chron.*, and others who have followed it, would make out. "Hic despositus est Ceadvalla . . . . indictione secunda, ... pontificante . . . . Sergio . . . . anno secundo." A line or two of the epitaph runs:

"Cædual armipotens, liquit amore Dei,
Ut Petrum, sedemque Petri rex cerneret hospes . . . .
Barbaricam rabiem, nomen et inde suum

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(ii) St. Wilfrid and Brithwald.

Sergius was one of the many popes who favoured St. Wilfrid[1] in his long struggle against the 'Celtic customs.' And he supported him, not only by ordering that his dignity should be restored to him, but by approving of Brithwald as St. Theodore's successor in the See of Canterbury. For Brithwald showed himself a friend to Wilfrid. In the new archbishop's behalf the Pope wrote two letters.[2] The first was addressed to "Ethelred, Alfrid and Aldulf, kings of the Angles." In it Sergius bids them rejoice that the first of the apostles and the most firm rock of the faith, Peter, is mindful of them, and bids them gladly receive Bishop Brithwald, the primate of all Britain, bestowed on them by his (St. Peter's) authority. In his letter to all the bishops of Britain, Sergius rejoices in the good repute in which they are, informs them that Brithwald has, on account of his merits, obtained from him,[3] that is from Blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, the primacy of all the churches of Britain, and exhorts them to receive

Conversus convertit ovans, Petrumque vocari
Sergius antistes jussit," etc.

The epitaph is given oest n Mai's *Classic. Auctor.*, v. p. 404. Though the first to accomplish this pilgrimage, Cædwalla was not the first of our kings to form the intention of making it. We read in Bede (*H. E.*, iv. c. 4) that Oswy "bore so great affection to the Roman and apostolical institution, that, had he recovered of his sickness, he had designed to go to Rome, and there to end his days at the holy places."

[1] *Sup.*, p. 26 f.

[2] Ap. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, l. i., ed. Migne, pp. 1467–8. "Exsultate quod . . . . egregius ac primus app. Petrus fidei firmissima petra, ... nominum quoque vestrorum reminiscitur. . . . Et vos, igitur, ejus auctoritate collatum vobis antistitem Brithwaldum Cantiæ sedis præsulem totiusque Britanniæ primum pontificem . . . . mente devota suscipite."

[3] Hence the *L. P.* says simply: "Hic ordinavit Berectualdum Britanniæ archiep.scopum"; where by "ordinavit archiepiscopum" the conferring of the primacy must be understood, as in the text.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and obey their new primate as they would the Pope himself.[1]

(iii) Ceolfrid and V. Bede.

Among the many Englishmen who went to Rome in the days of Pope Sergius were certain monks of the monasteries of SS. Peter and Paul of Wearmouth. They had been sent by their abbot, the wise and energetic Ceolfrid, to obtain a charter of privilege for his double monastery, such as Benedict Biscop had obtained from Pope Agatho.[2] Doubtless from these monks Sergius would hear more particulars of the great learning of their fellow-monk, Bede. At the mention of the name of this noble Englishman, the glory of the Saxon Church, and the most enlightened man in Europe in his day, which of his countrymen does not feel a glow of just national pride? And what English writer, when he has occasion to mention his name, but feels a strong temptation to leave his subject and dilate on the transcendent merits of this simple northern monk? We must, however, resist our inclinations and refer our readers for information regarding him to any of the historians of England. For whatever their religious belief, one and all have a good word for Bede, the father of English History! The enthusiasm which, after the lapse of so many centuries, the name of Bede arouses in Englishmen to-day was apparently felt by his contemporary Pope Sergius. At any rate, William of Malmesbury has preserved for us a letter,[3] addressed by Pope Sergius (about the year 701)

[1] "Brithwaldus . . . . a nobis, imo a b. Petro App. principe primatum omnium ecclesiarum Britanniæ sortitus, cum sacro usu pallii . . . . illic demandatus est . . . . Monemus ut eidem . . . . ac si nobis debitum ministerii honorem exsolvere, et ut præsuli primatum gerenti efficaciter sciatis obedire." *Cf. Sup.*, Pt. I. 272, etc., regarding these two letters.

[2] Bede, *Vit. Abbat.*, § 15.

[3] *Gesta. Reg. Angl.*, ed. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 179, p. 1015. "Erit enim, ut confidimus, etiam cunctis tibi creditis, profuturum quidquid Ecclesiæ generali claruerit per ejus præstantiam impertitum."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to abbot Ceolfrid, in which he asks him to send Bede to Rome, so that he (Sergius) may consult with Bede. That Bede, however, never went to Rome seems certain, as he himself tells us[1] that he never left his monastery. But there does not seem sufficient reason to doubt with some that he was summoned there. Possibly the reason why Bede remained at home was that the Pope who summoned him died very soon after sending off the letter to Ceolfrid. In his letter to the abbot, Sergius says that certain difficult questions have arisen, and he is in need of learned men to aid him in looking into them; and therefore he asks Ceolfrid to send him without delay "that religious servant of God, Bede (*religiosum Dei famulum Bedam*), a priest of your monastery." The Pope undertakes that Bede shall return as soon as the business is finished for which he was summoned, and points out that what Bede may do for the Church will redound to the credit of the monastery. Some have doubted of the authenticity of this letter, because in a copy of it that is older than the work of Malmesbury (viz., a Cotton MS., Tiberius A. xv.), the name of Bede is not found,[2] but the letter N in its stead. All, however, that that proves is that the one who transcribed the letter (Tiberius A. xv.) could not clearly make out the copy he had before him. And as Bede's name is found not only in Malmesbury, but in a MS. copy of the whole letter, of which Malmesbury only professes to give us extracts, we find the letter now accepted by such an authority as Jaffé.[3] Hence if Bede did not go to Rome, he was probably summoned there.

[1] *H. E.*, v. 24.

[2] The passage runs: "Dei famulum N venerabilis tui monasterii." *Cf.* Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 248–50.

[3] *Regest. Pont.*, 2138 (1642). *Cf.* notes 51 and 63 in Migne, as cited above. Lingard, *A.-S. Church*, ii. note K, for the opposite view.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(iv) St. Aldhelm.

From the number of distinguished Englishmen who went to Rome in his time, it may be argued that Sergius must have been one of the many popes who have had and displayed great love for this country. Among the rest who visited Pope Sergius was the most popular Englishman, not only of his own time, but of many succeeding years, the abbot Aldhelm, afterwards Bishop of Sherburne, and the practical founder of Malmesbury Abbey. The present abbey church of Malmesbury, which, partly in ruins and partly in use, does so much to deepen the old-world aspect of that quaint old Wiltshire town, well typifies, with its massive yet comely Norman pillars, the strong, yet most attractive character of the monk Aldhelm.[1] Having obtained large grants of land for his monastery from the kings of Mercia and Wessex, he went, with their consent, to Rome to obtain from Pope Sergius a charter of privilege for his beloved abbey. William of Malmesbury tells[2] us with pride how well Aldhelm was received by the Pope, who made the abbot stay with him in the Lateran palace, and was delighted to find in the Anglo-Saxon as well learning as piety. Charmed with his virtue, Sergius made no difficulty in granting Aldhelm (about 701) a brief, placing his monasteries[3] of Malmesbury and Frome under the immediate jurisdiction of Rome.[4]

[1] On Aldhelm, read Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, v. 25 f.; Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, May 25.

[2] *De Gest. Pontif.*, I. v. p. 1637, ed. Migne. The whole of this book, in four parts, is taken up with the life of Aldhelm. "Excitabat venerantiam pontificis (Sergii) in abbatem, quod videretur a vitæ ejus religione non discrepare scientiam, moribus non dissidere doctrinam."

[3] Malmesbury (*ib.*, p. 1639) quotes the whole document, that "those who now think that it may be outraged with impunity may know to what penalties they render themselves liable."

[4] "Præsentibus apostolicis privilegiis prædicta monasteria decernimus munienda; quatenus sub jurisdictione atque tuitione ejusdem, cui et

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The love and respect for the See of Peter with which our forefathers were animated, and which, despite the difficulties and dangers of the way, urged them to Rome in these centuries to visit the Popes, was, of course, of a practical kind, of a kind which moved them to try to bring others to the same way of thinking as themselves. And so, wherever they came into contact with any want of proper submission to the Holy See, they at once endeavoured to subdue it. And while St. Wilfrid in the North of England endeavoured to bring the Celts into line with the Roman Church on the Easter question, St. Aldhelm did the same in the South-West. Urged by a West Saxon synod, Aldhelm wrote (705) to Geraint (Geruntius), King of the Britons of Dyfnaint (Devonshire and Cornwall), and to the priests of his kingdom, to conform to the practices of the Roman Church in the matter of the tonsure and Easter. After unfolding the questions to them, he implored them "no longer contumaciously to turn their backs on the doctrine and decrees of Blessed Peter, and not, relying on the obstinacy of might, arrogantly to despise the tradition of the Roman Church on account of the ancient decrees of their forefathers. For Peter, when, with happy voice, he had confessed the Son of God, deserved to hear: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, etc.; and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (St. Matt. xvi. 18). If then the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given by Christ to Peter . . . . who that sets at naught the principal decrees of his Church will enter the gates of heaven. . . .? But perchance some wily (*strophosus*) book-worm or smart analyst of the Scriptures may offer some such defence as this: 'With all the

nos deservimus, auctoris nostri b. Petri, et ejus, quam dispensamus, Ecclesiæ et nunc sint et in perpetuum permaneant" (*ib.*, 1640).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sincerity of a believing heart do I venerate the doctrines of both the Old and New Testament (*utriusque instrumenti*). I confess the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc. . . . . and by virtue of this faith I shall be accounted a Catholic.' . . . . 'Thou believest that there is one God. Thou dost well. The devils also believe and tremble. . . . Faith without works is dead' (St. James ii. 19). For Catholic faith and the harmony of fraternal charity go hand in hand. And to sum up all in one conclusion, to no purpose do they boast of their possession of the Catholic faith, who do not follow the doctrine and teaching of St. Peter.[1] For the foundation of the Church and the support of the faith, resting in the first instance (*principaliter*) on Christ, and then (*sequenter*) on Peter, will never be shaken by tempests. As the apostle notes: 'For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid which is Jesus Christ' (1 Cor. iii. 11). And to Peter has truth itself thus assigned his position in the Church: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.'"

This letter caused many to conform to the Catholic celebration of Easter, says Bede (*H. E.*, v. 18).

The 'Quinisext' or 'Trullan' Synod, 692.

But it is time to retrace our steps and treat of matters that concerned the Universal Church. The first of these affairs of general interest that calls for our attention is the so-called 'Quinisext' Council of 692, well described[2] by our first historian Bede as 'erratic.' The 'cruel and presumptuous'[3] Justinian II., in the year 692,[4] reflecting

[1] "Frustra de fide catholica inaniter gloriatur, qui dogma et regulam S. Petri non sectatur." Ep. ap. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 273; or *M. G. H. Epp.*, iii. p. 235.

[2] *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 698.

[3] Finlay's estimate of him. *Hist. of Greece*, i. p. 386.

[4] On the date, etc., of this council, *cf.* Héfélé, v. p. 221, etc., Eng. trans. By the Greeks the acts of this synod are spoken of as the acts of the Sixth General Council. *Cf.* the address of the bishops of the Quinisext Council to the emperor.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that the fifth and sixth œcumenical councils had issued indeed important dogmatic decrees, but had not published any disciplinary canons, summoned a synod to supply this omission. As a sort of complement to the fifth and sixth councils, this synod received the extraordinary name of 'Quinisext'; though it is sometimes called the Trullan synod, because it was held in the same 'domed' hall as the Sixth General Council. From the extant subscriptions to its canons, it appears that some 211 Eastern bishops took part in this council, so fraught with important results both in the history of the Church and in that of Europe. By legalising a *married* clergy the fathers of this council so far at least degraded the whole body of the Eastern clergy as to render it, by that very concession, less powerful for good; and, drawing such a sharp line of demarcation between Eastern and Western custom on such an important practical question, made a still further step in the direction of the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches—a separation fatal to Christianity in the East. The attempt on the part of this synod to place the See of Constantinople on a level in ecclesiastical matters with that of Rome was of course another advance towards schism. And anything that tended to produce isolation of the Eastern Church meant isolation and destruction for the Greek empire. The council 'in Trullo,' remarks Finlay,[1] was "an additional cause of separation, when the strictest unity of religious opinions was necessary to maintain the political power of the empire."

Of the 102 canons decreed by the Quinisext Council, some consist simply of the renewal of ancient canons; some, again, were liturgical; while others treated of monks and nuns, fasting and superstitions. Many of the decrees were made in direct opposition to the custom of the Roman

[1] *Hist. of Greece*, i. p. 386.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Church. Among others, one of the canons on clerical celibacy (the thirteenth), after setting forth the opposite discipline of the Roman Church, adds: "We, however, allow them (priests and deacons) to continue in matrimony," and forbid them to send away the wives they had before their promotion to Sacred Orders.—Thus did these infatuated Greeks cast away the salt that preserves the Church, a celibate clergy. By their thirty-sixth canon also, the Orientals aimed a blow at the See of Rome that only recoiled on themselves, and left them more than ever the slaves of the emperors of Constantinople. "We define," runs the canon,[1] "that the See of Constantinople shall enjoy equal rights with that of Old Rome, shall be exalted in ecclesiastical affairs as it is, and shall be second after it." It may be noted in passing what a striking acknowledgment that canon was of the pre-eminent position in the Church of the Roman Pontiff at that time! While endeavouring to snatch the crown, it showed on whose head it was!

These canons were signed by the emperor, and by all the great patriarchs but the Roman, whose place, immediately after the emperor's, was left unfilled. If Archbishop Basil of Gortyna, in Crete, signed the decrees, adding, after his name, "holding the place of the whole synod of the Holy Church of Rome," just as he did at the Sixth General Council, it was not that he had received any special commission from Rome to represent it at the council, but that he acted on his own responsibility. And when

[1] Can. 36. *ὁρίζομεν ὥστε τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύειν πρεσβείων τοῦ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης θρόνου, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκεῖνον μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δεύτερον μετ' ἐκεῖνον ὑπάρχοντα.* As the *Liber Synodicus* (quoted by Pitzipios, *L'église Orientale*, p. 12) states, the patriarchs of Constantinople wished to be as powerful in the Church as in the State! *πανταχοῦ μεγαλύνεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς πράγμασιν.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the *Book of the Popes*, in its life of Sergius, says[1] that the 'legates' of the Pope subscribed, deceived by the emperor, it means the papal *apocrisiarii* resident at Constantinople. For it is quite certain that no legates were despatched by the Pope to represent him at the council. And when Nicholas I., in a letter to the Emperor Michael (ep. 86, an. 865), speaks of the emperor's predecessors, in the time of Pope Conon, leading into error those who wanted to save them, Héfélé believes he refers to these very *apocrisiarii*, who had at least been sent to Constantinople by Conon.

Justinian, however, knowing well that without the signature of the Roman Pontiff the decrees of his council would have no force in the West at any rate, straightway sent them to Rome, and required the Pope, as 'the head of all the bishops,' to sign them. But though many of the decrees were excellent, it was not to be expected that the Pope would sign them as a whole. And indeed he boldly declared[2] that he would die rather than put his signature to them; and he would not allow them to be read. As usual with the rulers of Constantinople, Justinian at once had recourse to violence. "And well was it for the Roman See," says a non-Catholic writer,[3] "that a strong man filled the chair of St. Peter." Finding that carrying off two of the Pope's councillors to Constantinople had no effect in daunting Sergius, the emperor sent Zacarias, his proto-

[1] "In quo (concilio) et Legati Sedis Apostolicæ convenerant, et decepti subscripserant." *L. P.*

[2] "Compellabatur et ipse (papa) subscribere, sed nullatenus acquievit. Pro eo quod *quædam* capitula extra ritum ecclesiasticum fuerant in eo annexa. Quæ synodaliter definita . . . . in hanc urbem ad confirmandum, vel in superiori loco subscribendum Sergio Pontifici, utpote capiti omnium sacerdotum (imperator) direxit. . . . Eos (tomos synodi) ut invalidos respuit . . . . eligens ante mori quam novitatum erroribus consentire." *L. P. Cf.* Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 698; Paul. Diac., *De Gest. Langob.*, vi. 11.

[3] Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vi. p. 354.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

spatharius, or captain of the bodyguard, to Rome with orders to drag the Pope himself to Constantinople.

But "a change had come over the spirit of the dream" since the days of Pope Martin. Mingled with the scant residue of the Italian citizens of the Roman empire, the barbarians, who broke that empire to pieces, and had settled down in Italy, its fairest province, were beginning to form a new and vigorous Italian people. Italy, or those parts of it in which they dwelt, was now beginning to be regarded by them as their country. They were organising themselves[1] for its defence. They were beginning to see that it was not the emperor of Constantinople that had their interests at heart; they could see that their money was all he cared for. On the other hand, it was equally plain[2] to them that the only one of any position who had any care for their concerns, and who was any manner of protection to them against the tyrannical Greek official or the Lombard, was the Bishop of Rome. Around him, then, would they rally! No longer would they allow him to be carried off with insult to Constantinople. Accordingly, no sooner did the errand of Zacarias become known, than the "army of Ravenna and of the Duchy of Pentapolis"[3] marched to Rome. In terror Zacarias begged the Pope to have the gates of the city shut; and with tears besought him not to allow anyone to lay hands on him. But soon the troops of Ravenna were thundering at the gates of the

Zacarias in Rome to carry off the Pope, 693 or 694.

[1] *Cf. sup.* on what has been said of the 'army' of Rome (exercitus Romanæ militiæ. *L. P.* in vit. Serg.) of this period. What is to be said presently, "Ravennatis militiæ," etc., shows that local forces—in opposition to Byzantine troops—were already in active service at Ravenna, etc.

[2] This is the thought of Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, ii. pp. 181–3, Eng. trans.

[3] First mention of this duchy, which included the districts around the five maritime cities of Ancona, Sinigaglia, Fano, Pesaro, and Rimini.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lateran palace. The guardsman took refuge under the Pope's bed, and Sergius showed himself to the soldiers. The people were somewhat appeased when they found that, contrary to the report, the Pope had not been carried off during the night and placed on board ship for Constantinople. Calmed by the Pope's word, they spared the guardsman's life, but drove him in ignominy from the city.[1] "And," adds the papal biographer, "by the action of Divine justice, he who sent the guardsman was at this time deprived of his kingdom." The reference is to the uprising of Leontius (695), who, by a successful *coup de main*, seized the imperial throne, and sent off the cruel Justinian with his nose slit as an exile to Cherson.[2] Thus did one more angry wave beat but to break itself into impotent spray and foam against the rock of Peter.

St. Willibrord and Frisia.

The country lying between the Rhine and the Elbe, and bounded on the north by the ocean, and which, at this period, bore the name of Frisia, had received already the first seeds of Christianity from St. Eligius and our own St. Wilfrid. But it was reserved for another Anglo-Saxon, sent by Pope Sergius, to complete the conversion of Frisia. Willibrord, one of that large number of devoted English and Irish saints that won to the faith of Christ the whole of Central Europe, arrived in Frisia about the year 691; and when Eddi was writing his life of Wilfrid, was, as that biographer noted (c. 26), still continuing the work of his master (Wilfrid) in converting the people of Friesland. Trained in St. Wilfrid's monastery of Ripon, and in Ireland, Willibrord conceived a great desire to labour in a vineyard,

[1] All these details in the *L. P.* Sergius "suavi responso, eorum corda linivit, quamquam illi zelo ducti pro amore et reverentia tam Ecclesiæ Dei, quamque sanctissimi Pontificis . . . . denominatum spatarium cum injuriis et contumeliis a civitate depulerunt."

[2] Theoph. in *Chron.*, ad an. 687; Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 698.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

wherein some of his fellow-monks had gone to toil, but had gleaned but little fruit. As soon as Willibrord landed, he found that the prospects of preaching the faith with success were greater than before, owing to the fact that Pepin of Heristal had made Radbod, duke of the Frisians, acknowledge the suzerainty of the Franks. Accordingly "he made haste[1] to get to Rome, that he might begin his wished-for labour of preaching the Gospel to the heathens, with the leave and blessing of Pope Sergius, who was then Pope." He also, adds Bede, wanted thence to learn or procure various things which so great a work required.

Great success attended the labours of Willibrord and his fellow-workers. With the consent of all, Willibrord was sent to Rome by Pepin, with the request that he might be made archbishop of the Frisians. Very willingly did Sergius consent, and Willibrord was consecrated (November 21, 695) in St. Cecilia's. The Pope on that occasion changed his name to Clement, and sent him back to his bishopric fourteen days after his arrival in Rome.[2] A most interesting document has preserved for us the true date of the consecration of Willibrord. It is ordinarily stated, on the authority of Ven. Bede, that he was consecrated November 22, 696, which was a Wednesday.

[1] "Acceleravit (Willibrordus) venire Romam, ... ut cum ejus (Sergii) licentia et benedictione, desideratum evangelizandi gentibus opus iniret" (Bede, *H. E.*, v. c. 11). The great St. Boniface, who himself laboured in Frisia, and was finally martyred there (755), says: "Tempore Sergii . . . : venit ad limina SS. App. presbyter . . . . nomine Willibrord . . . . quem præfatus Papa episcopum ordinavit, et ad prædicandam paganam gentem Fresonum, transmisit in littoribus Oceani occidui." (Ep. ad Pap. Stephanum, No. 109, ed. Dümmler *M. G. H. Epp.*, iii.)

[2] Bede, *ib.* "Misit Pippinus . . . . Willibrordum Romam, ... postulans ut eidem Fresonum genti archiepiscopus ordinaretur," etc. (*Cf.* Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 698; *L. P.*). On St. Willibrord, see Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, for Nov. 7, and the authorities there quoted.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But in the National Library at Paris there is preserved a MS. Calendar (Lat. 10837) (a part of which has been published in *facsimile*), which was used by St. Willibrord himself. In the margin of this calendar he has written that he came from across the seas into France in the year 690; that, though unworthy, he was ordained bishop by the Apostolic Pope Sergius in 695; and that 'now,' in the year 698, he was still at work. The day, indeed, of his consecration is not marked by the saint himself, but an apparently contemporary hand has added, in the margin of the calendar, to the 21st November the words, "The consecration of our lord Clement." The 21st November, a *Sunday*, is then clearly the true date. All this is told us by Duchesne in his notes to the biography of Sergius in his edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

By the time of his death (739) the Frisians, as a nation, had become Christian. It is surely scarcely necessary to call attention to the fact that the history of the missionary work of the apostle of the Frisians is another proof that in the West the Gospel was only preached by those 'who were sent,' that is, 'received their mission,' from the successors of St. Peter.

The schism of Aquileia extinguished, 698.

Mention has already[1] been made of the success of

[1] In the *Life* of St. Gregory I., *cf. L. P.* in vit.; Paulus, *De Gest. Langob.*, vi. 14; Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 708, who writes: "A synod convened at Aquileia had not confidence, by reason of its ignorance of the true faith, to act upon the resolutions of the Fifth General Council. But at length, instructed by the salutary admonitions of the Blessed Pope Sergius, it, in conjunction with the rest of the Churches of Christ, assented to its decrees." *Cf.* the rude contemporary poem quoted in Waitz's ed. of Paulus Diac., *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 190. One of its stanzas runs thus:

Utreque parti rex pius elegere
Cunincperct jubet legatos diregere
sedem ad sanctam, ubi Christo presole
data potestas nectere et solvere
Petro piscanti cæli archeclavio.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Pope Sergius in extinguishing the schism of Aquileia. Comparing the accounts of this affair that have been left us by the *Liber Pontificalis*, by Bede and Paul the Deacon, with the contemporary poem edited by Bethmann, it would appear either that a synod was first held at Aquileia, in which the schism was reaffirmed, and that then afterwards, by the efforts of Pope Sergius and King Cuninepert, who summoned a synod at Pavia about 700, the schism was quashed for ever at that council. Or else, what seems more likely, that what Bede and the others call the 'synod of Aquileia,' simply meant, as it often did in the language of those times, the collection of suffragan bishops under the patriarch of Aquileia. Hence we may conclude that the king of the Lombards, acting in unison with the Pope, invited the bishops of the schismatical patriarchate to a synod at Pavia. They came, and amidst tears of joy on their own part and those of the spectators, they declared their wish to be restored to the unity of the Church. The joyful news was sent to Sergius, who blessed the king with the words, that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins (St. James v. 20). At the same time he ordered that all the works treating on the errors of the late schismatics should be burnt, lest the new converts might be again troubled with the same evil doctrines.

The first 'doge' or duke of Venice, about 700.

The name of Sergius is also connected with another famous city in the north-east of Italy, with Venice, or, to speak more accurately, with the Venetians, who at this time inhabited the various islands, on some of which Venice was founded later on (about 710). Driven, willingly or unwillingly, from the mainland by Huns, Goths and Lombards, the inhabitants of the old province

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Venetia took refuge on the numerous islands that lie in the midst of the muddy shallows or lagunes situated between the rivers Adige and Piave. There, protected by[1] the shallows from the mainland and from the sea by the intricate channels between the outermost encircling islets, the Venetians maintained a practical, if not always nominal, independence from the days of the Goths until the days of that arch-destroyer Napoleon, called the Great.

Up to the period now being treated of, the different isles and cities of which the rising republic was formed were more or less independent of one another, each under its own 'tribune.' The result of this system of government was, of course, weakness both at home and abroad. Accordingly, about the year 700, there assembled in the city of Heraclea, Cristoforo, patriarch of Grado, his suffragans, the clergy, the tribunes, the nobles and the people. The outcome of their deliberations was the election of a duke or 'doge,' with authority over all the 'lagune state.' The first doge of Venice was Paoluccio Anafesto. It is also said by Hazlitt[2] that the promoters of this new constitution asked and obtained from Pope Sergius his confirmation of their action. On this Hazlitt remarks: "In a newly-formed society like that of Venice, placed in the difficult situation in which the republic found herself at the close of the seventh century . . . . it ought to create no surprise that the patriarch Christoforo and his supporters should have formed a unanimous determination to procure the adhesion and consent of the Holy See before any definite steps were taken to carry the resolutions of the popular assembly into effect. The mission,

[1] *Cf.* Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vi. 484 f.
[2] *History of the Venetian Republic*, vol. i. c. ii.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which was immediately despatched for this purpose to Aquileia, where the Pope was then holding a council,[1] consisted of Michele Participazio (or Badoer) and two other Venetian citizens of good family. The result was eminently favourable."[2] As, however, the beginnings of all great states are always more or less obscure, and as the principal authority for this account of the foundation of the Venetian republic is apparently the Chronicle[3] of the Doge, Andrea Dandolo, which, though a great work, was not written till the close of the first half of the fourteenth century, we must conclude that the origin of the Venetian Republic is not known with any great degree of certainty.

Sergius adorns and repairs various basilicas.

While thus occupied with such great external works as the conversion of nations, the extinction of schisms, and the foundation of states, Sergius did not neglect affairs at home of lesser moment. St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and other basilicas he repaired and adorned, and furnished with new and splendid vessels of marble, gold, and silver.[4] He also richly endowed and adorned the church of St. Susanna on the Quirinal, of which he had been parish priest, and which was in a very struggling condition, as both 'Anastasius' and a marble inscription pieced together by De Rossi, recording the deed of gift to the Priest John, inform[5] us.

[1] From what has just been said above, this is rather a misleading phrase. The Pope was not present in person, as far as we know, at this council of Aquileia.

[2] *Cf.* Hodgkin and Hazlitt, *ubi sup.*, and Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 697.

[3] Ap. Muratori, *R. I. S.*, xii. [4] *L. P.*

[5] De Rossi, *Bull. d. Arch. crist.*, 1870, p. 89 *seq.*, cited by Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 379–80, where this important document is given in full. The inscription, which runs to some sixty lines, begins as follows. The words in brackets show the restorations of De Rossi.

"Dilectissimo Filio Johanni $\overline{PB}$ (tituli scæ vir)ginis et martyris $\overline{XPI}$
Susan
Næet per eumeidem vene(rabili ecclæ) Sergius Episc. Servus sevorum $\overline{Di}$
Dum apostolicis pontific(ibus divinæ p)rovidentiæ suæ dignatione $\overline{Dns}$

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

He also discovered in an out-of-the-way corner of the sacristy of St. Peter's a silver box, which proved to contain a portion of the true cross enclosed in a beautifully jewelled cross,[1] which relic, say the historians[2] of this discovery, has ever since that time been 'kissed and adored' by all the people on the feast of the 'Exaltation of the Holy Cross' in the basilica of Our Saviour (the Lateran). While searching about in the sacristy, Sergius also came across the body of St. Leo the Great. This he transferred (June 28, 688) to a splendid tomb which he caused to be erected in a prominent position (*publico loco*) in the interior of the basilica itself, as again we have on the authority not only of the *Book of the Popes* but of the inscription still preserved,[3] set up by Sergius on the occasion.

Sergius adds the 'Agnus Dei' to the Mass.

In connection with the service of the Church, he ordained that "at the time of the breaking of Our Lord's body (in the Mass) the 'Agnus Dei' should be sung by clergy and people."[4] He also decreed that on the feasts of

Noster Ihs XPS eccles. su(æ regimen e)t ecclesiasticarum rerum dispen Sationem commiserit pr(o data potest)ate qui vicem apostolorum prin Cipis gerit libratione per(pendat opus) est ut peræquari debeant ec Clesiarum subjacentium Q(uæstus et indi)gentiam sustinenti succurri Quatenus non altera lau(to reditu gaudeat altera angustiis prematur inopi) Ae.

Farms are assigned to the Church from the Sabine, Tuscan, City (Urban) and other patrimonies. The inscription terminates with the usual denunciation against any who shall presume to alienate any of the Pope's gifts.

[1] Probably very like the famous cross of Justin II., still preserved at St. Peter's, writes Duchesne, i. 378.

[2] *L. P.*, and Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 701. "Quæ (crux) ex die illo . . . . ab omni populo Christiano . . . . osculatur ac adoratur."

[3] De Rossi, *Inscrip. Christ.*, t. ii.; Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 379. Two of the lines run:

"Sergius antistes, divino impulsus amore,
Nunc in fronte sacræ transtulit inde domus."

[4] *L. P.* *Cf.* Pagi, *Brev. Gest.*, n. 23 in vit., who discusses the introduc-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the 'Annunciation,' the 'Nativity,' the 'Dormition' or Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and of 'St. Simeon' (or the Purification),[1] litanies should be recited from the Church of St. Adrian to St. Mary.

Death of Sergius, 701.

This great and holy Pope was buried in St. Peter's (September 8, 701). The epitaph which Baronius gives as belonging to this Pope really belongs to Sergius III. But we may cite as his epitaph what Alcuin[2] says of him in his metrical life of St. Willibrord :

> "Pontificalis apex, Petri *dignissimus* heres,
> *Sanctus* apostolicam tenuit tunc Sergius aulam
> Vir bonus et prudens, *nulli pietate secundus*."

Review of work done up to this point.

We have now set forth the history of the popes for a hundred years ; and, considering the number of biographies that have had to be written, it must be confessed that not very much has been said about them. The reason of that, however, is, that there is very little to be said. Of all the centuries of the Middle Ages, we know least about this their first century, at any rate as far as the popes are concerned, with the possible exception of the tenth century. In the dearth of historical records,[3] practically all that is to be told of the popes of the seventh century has now been told.

The popes of the seventh century all good men.

From what the genuine records of history have made known to us, we see that during this seventh century the See of Rome was occupied by an unbroken succession of good

tion of the 'Dona Nobis pacem,' instead of the 'miserere nobis,' the third time that the 'Agnus Dei' is said.

[1] "Quod Græci 'hypapantem' appellant." *L. P.*

[2] *Monument. Alc*, p. 66, c. 4 ; *cf. Acta SS. Boll.*, 9th September, iii. 425-445.

[3] Hearken to the lament of Muratori (*Annal.*, ad an. 698) : "Nè vo' lasciar di accenare quanto fosse in questi tempi infelice la condizion delle lettere in Italia, perchè mancante di scuole e di maestri. . . . Per cagione di tanta ignoranza rarissimi erano allora coloro che scrivessero libri, e per gran tempo niuno ci fu che registrasse gli avvenimenti e la storia del suo secolo."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

men. It opened and closed with the fourteen years' reign of a saint. So bright are their characters, that it would be to degrade them to contrast them with, we will not say, the secular princes of their time, but even with their would-be rivals, the ambitious patriarchs of Constantinople. There are, indeed, a number of modern historians who, to serve their ends or to indulge a habit, have supplied from their imaginations the lacunæ of contemporary authorities. With material thus derived, they have endeavoured to detract from, or to dull the bright characters of some of the popes of this seventh century, by attributing more or less disreputable 'motives' to their actions. We have tried to steer clear of such an unscientific and unsatisfactory course, and to let the plain facts of history speak for themselves. And again we assert that these facts tell us that if Honorius I. was a little weak in theological acumen, the aged Conon somewhat wanting, on one occasion, in economical foresight, the popes of the seventh century were model men, and a credit to the high position they occupied.

Work done by the popes in the seventh century.

Abroad we have seen the popes materially assisting in the conversion of nations to the faith of Christ, in the foundation of states, in extinguishing schisms, and combatting heresies backed by imperial power; and, by their influence over the barbaric kings of the Lombards, saving Rome for the empire and its citizens. And though we have seen the Holy See kept vacant for months, the palace of the popes plundered, themselves assailed with violence and sent off to exile and to death, in what condition do we find them at the close of the century? Stronger than they were at the beginning. The schism that weakened their power in Italy has been closed, and they have become so strong in the affections of the people that the despotic power of the Eastern emperors has

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

broken against them. By the end of this century the popes have become safe from Oriental tyranny, and, we may add, their temporal power is assured. For in the next century we shall see that temporal power an accomplished fact, and Italy freed, by the action of the popes, from the incubus of the Lombards, as it was practically freed in this century from the Eastern emperors.

Completion of the 'foundations' of the 'temporal power.'

In this century, then, it is asserted that the foundations of the temporal power of the popes were strengthened to the point of being ready to receive the superstructure. While we find Gibbon, Milman, and Greenwood,[1] in their calmer moments, asserting that it 'was the circumstances of the times' that forced temporal power into the hands of the popes, we find many at all times roundly proclaiming that it was by their own ambitious exertions that such power ever fell into their hands. Their proof of their proposition would seem to be that the popes did acquire temporal power, and *therefore* it must have been the result of their ambition. As historical data are wanting to them, they fall back upon '*logic*'! The records of the history of the popes of the seventh century show, however, that the popes owed their temporal power to the manner in which they attached to themselves the people of Italy, by the unexceptionable arts of defending their civil liberties against emperor and Lombard, of expending the wealth of the Holy See on the poor and the captive, and of upholding even to death the rights of conscience!

May it be ours now to write the history of the popes of the eighth century, and to unfold the causes which developed the temporal power of the popes, such as we

[1] Speaking of the court of Constantinople, he says (*Cathedra Petri*, Bk. iii. p. 195), "a nominal allegiance was all that could be claimed (from Rome) or yielded, while the real powers of government *fell by a natural necessity* into the hands of the chief (Gregory I.), who possessed the public confidence."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

have seen it in the hands of St. Gregory I., Honorius I., etc., into full and perfect independent regal sovereignty!

Papal officials of the seventh century.

Before, however, entering upon the biographies of the eighth century pontiffs, it may be convenient to bring together the brief scattered notices that are to be met with—chiefly in the letters of St. Gregory I. and the Ordo Romanus I.—concerning the officials through whom the pope governed his local See of Rome in the seventh century.

For purposes of spiritual administration the city was divided into parishes, in each of which was a *titular* church, presided over by a cardinal priest. At their head was the important archpriest.

For the temporal needs of the people, and for other purposes generally, the city had at a very early period been divided into *seven* regions, partly, perhaps, because the fourteen civil regions of the city could be easily divided into seven fresh divisions; partly, perhaps, for some mystical reason; and again, perhaps, that there might be a fixed set of officials each day to attend the pope at the various *stations*. It is certain that in the first ages of the Church, seven notaries had been appointed to take down the acts of the martyrs. When the centuries of persecution passed away, the notaries remained now in charge of the Papal Chancery, and at their head in the seventh century was one of the most distinguished members of the officials of the pope, viz., the primicerius[1] of the notaries.

In connection with the seven regions were seven deaconries, bureaux as it were, where all that concerned the poor[2] (hospitals, orphanages, etc.), was managed. At

[1] First mentioned in the *L. P.* under Julius I. (337-352).

[2] Diaconia "pro sustentatione et alimoniis fratrum nostrorum Christi pauperibus" (*Liber D.*, f. 95); St. Gregory (xi. 17, al. 27) chose a man "mensis pauperum et exhibendæ diaconiæ elegimus præponendum."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the head of these establishments, as their name implies, was a deacon. And over the deacons themselves was a great functionary, the archdeacon, who is spoken of in the *Ordo Romanus* as the Vicar of the Pope. Of all the Roman officials of the seventh century, the regionary deacons were the most important. From them were selected the apocrisiarii who were sent to Constantinople, and from their ranks were chosen the successors of St. Peter. Their orders were carried out by the regionary subdeacons and acolytes.

By all these functionaries was the pope assisted at the *stations*; and, during the vacancy of the Holy See or during the absence of the pope, the Roman See was governed by the archpriest, the archdeacon and the primicerius of the notaries.

We have already seen how, equally in connection with the seven regions, Gregory the Great established a college of *defensors*, with a primicerius at their head, for the management of the patrimonies of the Church in Rome and elsewhere—the patrimonies whence were drawn the means by which the work and charities undertaken by the Roman Church were able to be carried on. The *dispensator ecclesiæ* seems to have been the head permanent official connected with the administration of the patrimonies.

In the documents of the seventh century there is also frequent mention of the *schola cantorum*, again subject to a primicerius. It was there, apparently, that the young aspirants for the ranks of the Roman clergy received their general as well as their musical education. They are said to have left it when they had received the minor order of acolyte.

Many other officers of the Roman Church are also not unfrequently mentioned in our sources. There was the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Vicedominus, whom some would distinguish from the *Major-domo*, assigning to the first[1] the charge of the papal palace, and to the second the functions of a guest-master. The *nomenclator*[2] was a sort of gentleman-usher; the *arcarius*, the treasurer, chief of the papal exchequer; and the *saccellarius*, the paymaster, though Ewald[3] rather regards him as an almoner.

Among the lay assistants of the pontifical administration of high standing was the *consiliarius* (possibly legal adviser[4]) of the Holy See. This official, several times met with in the letters of Gregory the Great, is first noticed by Pope Vigilius. Of the minor laymen in the service of the Church were the *mansionarii*, who had to look after the churches, much as the modern sacristans do. It only remains to be stated that as time went on we shall find the sphere of action of some of these officials diminished and that of others extended. Temporal power, too, will bring with it new officers.

[1] Greg. I., Ep. xi. 21 (33). Vicedominus has "curam episcopii"; and the Major-domo (Ep. xi. 54, al 72), "hospitalitatem et susceptiones exhibere."

[2] Miley, *Hist. of Papal States*, i. 450.

[3] Epp. Greg., ed. Ewald, i. p. 328 n.

[4] Ewald, note to Greg. Ep., iii. 18, says he knows not what was the office or what the rank of the *consiliarius* among the officials of the Apostolic See. He must certainly be regarded as a layman of great dignity, as he is spoken of by Gregory as *vir magnificus*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN VI.

A.D. 701–705.

Sources.—Short life in the *L. P.* Eddius' *Life of St. Wilfrid* gives John's connection with that saint and England. *Cf.* Bede, *H. E.*, v. 19.

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarchs of Ravenna.
Tiberius III. (Apsimar), 698–705.	Aripert II., 700–712.	John Platyn, 687–702. Theophylact, 702–709.

AFTER a vacancy of one month and twenty-three days, John, a Greek, was consecrated Bishop of Rome (October 30, 701).

The exarch Theophylact in Rome, 702.

Probably sometime during the year 702 there came from Sicily to Rome the new exarch Theophylact, Chamberlain and Patrician. Why he came to Rome we do not know. Many modern authors are prepared to tell us. But the cause assigned is of their own making, and consequently in accordance with their prejudices. Theophylact may have been simply passing through on his way to Ravenna. However, whatever may have been his reason in coming to Rome, supposing he had any particular reason at all, his advent was viewed with suspicion by the friends of the Pope, that is by all Italy, by all at least not subject to the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lombards. Accordingly, on hearing of the exarch's visit, the troops of the whole of Italy[1] marched tumultuously to Rome, encamped outside the city, and made their ill-will to the exarch particularly evident. The Pope, alarmed for Theophylact's safety, ordered the city gates to be shut, sent priests to the camp, and through their exertions quelled the sedition. Though the rioters spared the exarch, they took vengeance on some of his would-be creatures, and inflicted[2] grievous punishment on certain informers who had taken advantage of the exarch's presence to impeach certain worthy citizens, that they might have an opportunity of fingering wealth that was not their own. Amid the obscurity that surrounds this incident, one thing stands out clear, and it is the loyalty of the popes to the rule of the emperors, a loyalty that one act of tyranny after another against themselves has not shaken, at least in them. But the action of the local militia towards the 'Life Guard' officer Zacharias and towards the exarch Theophylact shows that submission on the part of their Italian subjects to the Eastern emperors' rule—a rule impotent and tyrannical at least in Italy—was rapidly becoming a thing of the past. This eighth century will see the end of it over by far the greater part of the territory that in the preceding century rendered a more or less full obedience to the exarch of Ravenna.

The Lombards again begin to give trouble to the Duchy of Rome, 702 (?).

For some cause or other, the Lombards begin again during this pontificate to give trouble to the Duchy of Rome, and hence to the popes. Whether the Lombards were now more than ever convinced of the weakness of the exarch, or whether their own power was by this time more

[1] "Cujus adventum cognoscentes militia totius Italiæ tumultuose convenit apud hanc Romanam civitatem, volens præfatum exarchum tribulare." *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

consolidated, they were at this period engaged in extending their frontiers in all directions at the expense of those of the exarch. Gisulf I., Duke of Benevento (686–706), increased his sway by getting possession of the towns of Sora, Arpinum and Arx from the Duchy of Rome, thus advancing the border of his own duchy to the river Liris; and bursting into the Campagna, perhaps in the year 702, advanced as far as a place which the *Liber Pontificalis* calls 'Horrea,'[1] and which Dr. Hodgkin thinks[2] to be the great granary of Puteoli, and there pitched his camp. He advanced, plundering, burning, and carrying off captives; and, pathetically adds the papal biographer, "there was no one who could resist him."[3] But, as usual, there was one able and willing to come to the succour of the poor Italians—the Pope of Rome. John VI. sent to the camp of Gisulf several priests furnished with large sums of money, and they redeemed all the captives he had taken, and induced the warlike duke to return to his own country.[4] Such *arts* as these are the only ones known to *history* by which more and more temporal power was acquired by the Popes, or rather forced into their hands!

Decrees in favour of St. Wilfrid, 703–704.

His exertions in behalf of St. Wilfrid have already been set down.[5] To Brithwald, "whom by the authority[6] of the

[1] Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 702, says of the name "probabilmente è fallato." It may have been at the fifth milestone on the Via Latina, where in the days of Gregory II. was 'fundus Horrea.' Jaffé, 2227 (1715).

[2] *Italy*, etc., vi. p. 336.

[3] "Nullusque extitisset, qui ei potuisset resistere." *Cf.* Paulus, *Hist. Lang.*, vi. 27; and Joan. Diac., *Vit. Epp. Neap.*, Part I., ap. Muratori, *R. I. S.*, tom. 1, who follow the *L. P.*

[4] "Pontifex, missis Sacerdotibus, cum apostolicis donariis, *universos* captivos de eorum manibus redemit, et illum cum suo stolo (exercitu) ad propria repedare fecit." (*L. P. Cf.* Paulus, *ib.*)

[5] *Sup.*, p. 34. *Cf.* Eddius; Bede, v. 19; Malmesb., *Gest. Pont.*, ap. Migne, t. 179, p. 1568. Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iv. p. 323 f.

[6] Eddius, in vit. S. Wilf., c. 54.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Sends the pallium to Archbishop Brithwald.

Prince of the Apostles we have confirmed as Archbishop (of Canterbury)," John VI. sent the pallium.

Except that he held the usual ordinations of priests, deacons and bishops for 'various places,' and made certain additions or improvements to a few of the churches, we know no more of John VI. but that he was buried at St. Peter's on January 11, 705.

Death of John VI.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN VII.

A.D. 705–707.

Sources.—The very short life in the *L. P.*, with incidental notices in Paul the Deacon, etc. The excavations which, in the course of the last few months, have brought to light the palace, etc., of John VII. have been well described by Mr. Rushworth in the *Guardian* and *Times* newspapers, and by Federici, *Archivio della R. Società Rom. di storia patria*, xxiii. 517 f.

Emperors of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Tiberius III. (Apsimar), 698–705.	Aripert II., 700–712.	Theophylact, 702–709.
Justinian II. (restored), 705–711.		

John VII., Pope; his character.

On March 1, 705, was consecrated as Bishop of Rome another Greek, John VII., of an illustrious family, the son of Blatta and Plato,[1] who "had held the high office of *Cura Palatii*, an office which, in Constantinople itself, was often held by the son-in-law of the emperor. Plato had in that capacity presided over the restoration of the old imperial palace at Rome, which was now the ordinary

[1] *L. P.*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

residence of the exarch's lieutenant."[1] The epitaphs to his father and mother, composed by John himself, when rector of the patrimony on the Appian Way (687), have come down to us. They were inscribed "with a broken heart to a most loving and incomparable mother, and to the kindest of fathers, by their son John." The care which Plato bestowed on the restoration of the old palace of the Cæsars on the Palatine, a building all too large for the residence of the *Dux Romæ*, his son, as we shall see, devoted to the repair of Rome's churches. And to this work, besides experience gained from his father, he brought a well-trained mind. For, as his biographer assures us, he was a man of very profound learning[2] and great eloquence, but, as is not unfrequently to be observed in learned speakers, his courage was not on a par with his oratory. This Pope was remarkable for his devotion to the Mother of God. The title he was most proud of was 'Mary's servant.'

John and the Quinisext decrees, 706.

Soon after John became Pope the cruel Rhinotmetus (Justinian II.) succeeded in again obtaining possession of the imperial throne. By lavish promises he won over to his cause Terbel, the king of the Bulgarians. He effected an entrance into the 'Blachernæ' quarter of Constantinople through an aqueduct. His rivals, Leontius and Apsimar, were beheaded after being exposed to the greatest ignominies. The patriarch Callinicus, who, to his credit, had shown his hate of the cruel character of the tyrant, was deprived of his eyes and sent to Rome. When he had glutted his appetite for revenge with the blood

[1] Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vi. p. 364, quoting Plato's epitaph (which was still visible in the fifteenth century in the Church of St. Anastasia), from Duchesne's ed. of the *Liber Pont.*, i. 386.

[2] "Vir eruditissimus, et facundus eloquentia . . . . sed humana fragilitate timidus." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of his enemies,[1] the brutal Justinian, either in the year 706, or perhaps more likely in the early part of the next, sent to John by the hands of two metropolitan bishops the same *Tomes* (tomi), six in number, which he had sent before to Pope Sergius; and in which, adds the *Book of the Popes*,[2] "were contained various points against the Church of Rome." Through the bishops, and through a letter which he despatched to the Pope at the same time, Justinian adjured John to assemble a council, to examine the decrees of the Quinisext Council, and to approve what he thought fit and to reject the rest. Whether it was that the report of the unbounded cruelty and fierceness of the 'Slit-nosed' emperor had struck terror into John, his biographer says that, 'timid through human frailty,' the Pope sent back the 'Tomes' without attaching any note at all to them. If he dared not condemn them, he would not approve them; for from the little we know of the affair it would be scarcely fair to argue that here silence gave consent. Perhaps John felt he had not the requisite strength to enter into a contest with Justinian, for we are told that he did not live long after this incident.[3]

The restoration of the patrimony of the Cottian Alps, 707.

If we may trust the old eleventh century chronicler Herman Contractus, it was in the year 707 that there took place the restoration of the 'patrimony' of the Cottian Alps to the See of Rome, spoken of by Bede and others.

[1] *Cf.* Niceph. in *Chron.*; Theoph. in *Chron.*, ad. an. 696-8. "Multos ex Apsimari militibus repertos, tam eos, qui pro ipso aliquid moliebantur, quam qui *quietem agerent*, *omnes* interfecit .... ex civium posthac militumque ordine *numerum propemodum infinitum* coegit perire."

[2] *L. P.* "In quibus (tomis) diversa capitula Romanæ ecclesiæ contraria scripta inerant." These 'tomes' were, of course, the six copies of the Quinisext Council; one being for the Pope himself, one for the emperor, and one for each of the four patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

[3] "Post quæ non diu in hac vita duravit." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

According to Paul the Deacon,[1] the fifth province of Italy went by the name of the 'Cottian Alps,' and included the western part, at least, of the ancient province of Liguria. In this province the Roman Church had of old large possessions, which had been seized by the Lombards. St. Gregory speaks of property belonging to the Roman Church in the neighbourhood of Genoa (Ep. xi., 6, 14, al. 4, 3, etc.). It was all confiscated when Rothari laid waste with fire (*incendio concremans*) and sword the whole littoral from Tuscan Luna to the territories of the Franks, and ordered the cities he had dismantled to be called villages! Of these lands Aripert II. made restitution,[2] sending notice thereof to Rome in a deed written in letters of gold. The exact nature of the rights possessed by the popes of this period over these and their other possessions is not easy to define. But there is no doubt, as it has been remarked before, that they (the popes) had more than mere rights of ownership over their 'patrimonies.' They had a considerable amount of jurisdiction in them, which they exercised, indeed, in submission to the emperor. Still, however, it was there; and it greatly facilitated the passing of many of the said patrimonies under the complete power of the popes in the course of this century.

Letter of John to the Bishop of England on the 'clerical dress,' 705-7.

Jaffé quotes a very interesting fragment[3] of a letter of

[1] *H. L.*, ii. 16. *Cf.* 18.

[2] Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 708, writes: "Aripertus, rex Longobardorum, multas cohortes (villas) et patrimonia Alpium Cottiarum quæ quondam ad jus pertinebant apostolicæ sedis, sed a Longobardis multo tempore fuerant ablata, restituit juri ejus; et hanc donationem aureis scriptam litteris, Romam direxit." *Cf.* Paul the Deacon, *H. L.*, vi. 23 (*cf.* vi. 48, where he narrates the confirmation of this deed of restitution by King Liutprand), and the *L. P.* For the devastations of Rothari, *cf.* Fredegar, c. 71; Paul, iv. 45.

[3] *Regest. Pont.*, 2145 (1647). The fragment is to be found ap. Baluze,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Pope to the English bishops and clergy, which shows the well-known love[1] of the Anglo-Saxons in general for fine apparel, and the consequent disinclination on the part of the Anglo-Saxon clerics in particular to renounce the secular dress and to adopt the more sober ecclesiastical costume. John describes how, on one occasion, when all the Anglo-Saxon notables who were then in Rome came to meet him, what he said had such weight[2] with his hearers that, on the vigil of St. Gregory, all the Anglo-Saxon clerics laid aside their ample lay garments and put on the cassock according to the Roman custom. He concludes by exhorting those to whom he is writing to go and do likewise.

The monasteries of Farfa and Subiaco.

This Pope's name is connected with two of Italy's, we might say the world's, most famous monasteries: the monastery of Farfa, situated on the Salarian road, and on the high ground between the valleys of Tibur and the Velino, and the monastery of Subiaco, built on that wild spot on the Anio, where St. Benedict went to pass his youth in solitude, and on which was afterwards built, by the saint, one of those Benedictine monasteries to which European civilisation owes so much. It was at the request of Faroald, Duke of Spoleto,[3] that John confirmed the possessions and gave various privileges to the monastery of Farfa (June 30, 705). The monastery of Subiaco, like its offshoot of Monte Cassino, destroyed

Miscell., i. 400. The Pope writes to the English, "auctoritate apostolica." The affair may belong to the reign of John VI., and to the year 704 (*cf.* Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 264).

[1] *Cf.* Lingard, *Anglo-Sax. Church*, i. p. 210 f., ed. Baker, London.

[2] "Apostolicæ sententia usque adeo sedis prævaluit, ut voluntarie omnes Anglorum clerici . . . . laicalem habitum deponentes, talares tunicas induerent" (Jaffé, *ib.*).

[3] *Chron. Farf.*, ap. Murat., *R. I. S.*, II. ii. 331. Some would question the authenticity of this bull.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by the Lombards (601), and abandoned for over one hundred years, was restored by this Pope, who sent thither the abbot Stephen for the purpose.[1]

John's 'church decorations.'

In his short reign John did a good deal in the way of church beautifying and restoration in different parts of the city. Among his other works in this direction, he built (706) a chapel to Our Lady in St. Peter's, and covered its walls with mosaics, which our Bede[2] describes as of 'admirable workmanship,' though, apart from considerations of the age in which they were executed, they are indifferent enough. In the centre of one of the two groups of figures stands the Blessed Virgin in the garb of a Byzantine empress, and at her right the Pope, his head crowned by a square nimbus, "and the model of the chapel in his hands. Traces of figures, together with the ancient inscription, may still be discovered in the crypt of the Vatican."[3] The inscription ran: "John, an unworthy bishop, the servant of the Blessed Mother of God, carried out this work." "The chapel," continues Gregorovius, "was pulled down in 1639 (1606?); and the remains of the mosaics removed to St. Maria in Cosmedin. Here the time-honoured relics still remain, built into the walls of the sacristy, and, rough in execution though they be, bear the stamp of an age, the pious simplicity and child-like faith of which it is scarcely possible for us to understand."

Sancta Maria Antiqua.

Other entries in the *Book of the Popes* have been

[1] *Cf.* Murat., *Annal.*, ad an. 707. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, ii. 200.

[2] *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 708. *Cf. L. P.*

[3] Gregorovius, *ib.*, p. 195. "*B. Dei Genitricis servus, Joannes indignus Episcopus fecit.*" The 'time-honoured relics' are not all in St. Maria in Cosmedin; some are in the Vatican crypts, others in the Lateran Museum, and in the Church of St. Mark in Florence (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 386).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

remarkably illustrated within the last few months. One passage, for instance, runs: "He adorned with frescoes (*pictura*) the basilica of the Holy Mother of God, which is known as *the Old*; and alongside of it he built a palace (*episcopium*) for himself, and there he lived and died." It is curious that John's home should be brought to light by descendants of the people about whose clothes he was solicitous, viz., by the British School of Archæology at Rome. Though, to anything but the credit of the nation, our School only came into existence in November 1899, it has not been idle since its birth. Its work in connection with S. Maria Antiqua had best be told in the words of the letter,[1] already cited, of Mr. Rushforth, the head of the School:

"The Church (S. Maria Antiqua) was installed in the ancient buildings (buried deep till a year ago beneath the garden of the now destroyed S. Maria Liberatrice), which occupied the space between the back wall of the colossal brick structure known as the Temple of Augustus and the substructures of the northern angle of the Palatine. Passing the Temple of Castor on the right, and the House of the Vestals, with the fountain and shrine of Juturna on the left, one reaches the precincts of the church. Its plan presents the regular features of a great Roman house or palace. Passing through the open portico which extended along the façade, one enters, as in the Flavian Palace on the Palatine, a great hall with niches (alternately round and square) for colossal statues in its walls. The door at its opposite end leads into an open court or peristyle, beyond which is the usual arrangement of a big room (*tablinum*), with one side completely open to the court, in the middle flanked by two smaller chambers. It is impossible, in this place, to discuss the origin and history

[1] Quoted by the *Tablet*, June 22, 1901.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of these buildings. But it may be taken that, in their present form, they belong to the time of Hadrian, and that, probably, their *raison d'être* is the spacious staircase, or rather, incline, which leads from the left-hand corner of the peristyle to the summit of the Palatine. They formed, in fact, the state entrance to the Palace from the Forum, or, to put it in another way, they may be thought of as part of the Palace brought down for the sake of convenience to the level of the Forum.

"Such was the building which had to be adapted to the uses of a church. The *tablinum* became the sanctuary, the chambers which flanked it side chapels. The central space of the peristyle was enclosed with low screens and formed the choir, while the great entrance hall served as the atrium. It is by no means clear that the open space of the peristyle was ever roofed in, even after it had been turned into a choir by being enclosed with a low wall, covered with paintings and fitted on the inside with a marble seat, which ran all the way round, except where on the left it was broken by the staircases which led to the ambo. When did this transformation take place, or begin to take place? Presumably not before the middle of the sixth century, the period of the Byzantine conquest. That was the age when the forms of the ancient world, being extinct, the Church first took possession of the disused public buildings. It is therefore not surprising to learn that the earliest mention of S. Maria Antiqua occurs in a catalogue of Roman churches made in the Byzantine period, possibly about the middle of the seventh century (De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea*, i. 143). Moreover, it is significant that we hear of it for the first time in the *Liber Pontificalis* at the beginning of the eighth century. Can we believe that the earlier part of the book, with its copious information about the oldest churches,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

would have omitted this one if it had existed very long before?

"But if the church was so recent as the sixth or seventh century, how are we to account for its title Antiqua? The difficulty is increased by the fact that while 'Old St. Mary's' ought to have a 'New St. Mary's' corresponding to it, the only S. Maria Nova we know was the church which replaced S. Maria Antiqua in the ninth century. They never existed side by side. There were other churches in Rome bearing the name of the Virgin much older than the one in the Forum, but they differed from it in this, that originally they were designated in quite another way. S. Maria Maggiore was the Basilica Liberii or Sicinini; S. Maria trans Tiberim was the Basilica or Titulus of Julius or of Callixtus. The latter does not appear as S. Maria trans Tiberim before the seventh century, whereas S. Maria Maggiore, after the restoration by Sixtus III. (432–440), and as late as John I. (523–526), is regularly mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* as St. Maria simply. Can we believe that this would have been so if S. Maria Antiqua had been already in existence? As common experience shows, 'old' in these cases of nomenclature means not absolutely, but relatively, old; and the most reasonable supposition seems to be that, while S. Maria Maggiore, as one of the greater basilicas, stands apart in a category of its own, S. Maria Antiqua was so called because it was the first church dedicated *ab initio* to the Virgin—*i.e.*, before the foundation of S. Maria Rotunda (the Pantheon), and before the church in the Trastevere acquired its new name, both in the seventh century. This is precisely the order given in the seventh century catalogue referred to above, where the Lateran is followed by S. Maria Major, S. Anastasia, S. Maria Antiqua, S. Maria Rotunda, S. Maria Trastiberis, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"We learn from the *Book of the Popes* that John VII. (705–707) decorated the church with paintings, and gave it a new *ambo*. Though discarded at a later date, the base of this *ambo* has actually been found in the church. It bears the inscription "Johannes servu(s) scæ Mariæ," and at the opposite end Ἰωάννου δούλου τῆς θεωτόκου. The style and lettering, as well as the sentiment, is exactly the same as that of the Pope's epitaph still preserved in the crypt of St. Peter—Johannis servi sanctæ Mariæ. His interest in this church was not solely due to his devotion to Mary. His father Plato, the *curæ palatii urbis Romæ*, as his official title ran, had lived in the imperial palace on the hill above, and when he died in 687 John had put up a monument to his memory in S. Anastasia, which mentions his restoration of the long staircase, perhaps the one which we still see connecting the Forum with the Palatine (De Rossi, *Inscr. Chr.*, ii. p. 442).

"When John became Bishop of Rome in 705 the Lateran had fallen into decay, and the *Liber Pontificalis* describes how, above S. Maria, *episcopium quantum ad se construere maluit, illicque pontificati sui tempus vitam finivit.* Brought into intimate relations with the church by means of the ascent before mentioned, John began to take a special interest in it. In addition to his gift of the ambo, he decorated it with paintings, and it becomes important to try to discover which, if any, of the considerable remains of painting in the church may be attributed to him. The only parts which can be dated with certainty belong to the middle of the eighth century and later. But there is good reason for thinking that the pictures on the walls of the square sanctuary are some of those executed under John. It is to be regretted that the difference of material and their fragmentary character make it difficult to draw any satisfactory comparison between the scattered relics of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

John's works in mosaic from the old St. Peter's and these paintings. The wall above the small apse, which must have contained the altar, shows at the summit the Crucifixion. On either side the white-robed elders are offering their crowns, as in the well-known mosaics at St. Paul's without the Walls and at S. Prassede. Below is a band of quotations in Greek from the Prophets, relating to the Crucifixion. Another band of adoring saints follows, and then, cut in the middle by the arch of the apse, we see a row of four popes. Everything here is much damaged, but two important details are certain. One of the popes on the right is St. Martin, who died in 655, and the one on the extreme left, though his name has perished, has the square nimbus, and is therefore, in all probability, the donor of the pictures—*i.e.*, John VII. The apse itself, with a colossal figure of Christ, has been painted again at a later date, for we can still see the head with its square nimbus and the name of Paul I. (757–767). Below the row of popes is a fragment of the dedicatory inscription: *S(an)c(t)æ D(e)i [genitr]ici sem[perque Virgini Mar]iæ.* Below this the walls on either side of the apse have been decorated again and again. A Madonna robed and crowned like a Byzantine empress, the four Evangelists, the four Fathers, have replaced one another at different times. The side walls of the sanctuary have been decorated at least twice; but the upper surface, which corresponds to the presumed work of John VII., represented the Gospel history with the Crucifixion on the main wall as its climax. The last scene on the left side wall is the procession to Calvary. To judge by the remains, the paintings on the screens which enclosed the choir and presbytery were of the same style and epoch. They were taken from the Old Testament, and were no doubt treated as types. The best preserved are David's victory over Goliath,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and Isaiah announcing to Hezekiah his approaching death.

"The chapel to the right of the sanctuary contains many single figures of saints. The place of honour is occupied by Stephen. The rest, like the inscriptions, are mainly Greek. Cosmas and Damian, Abbacyrus and John, Procopius, Panteleëmon, Celsus, are among the best preserved. The chapel to the left is the most perfect in the whole building. Some of the painting is as fresh as when it was executed, and equally important is the fact that it can be dated with precision. Below a Crucifixion, in which the living Redeemer is represented clothed in a long, sleeveless garment, a seated Madonna is flanked by SS. Peter and Paul, Quiricus and Julitta, and the square-nimbed, and therefore contemporary, portraits of Pope Zacharias (741–752) and the donor, who, as his inscription tells us, is Theodotus, *primicerius defensorum* and *dispensator* of the *diaconia* of St. Mary *qui appellatur antiqua*. The pictures on the side walls represent the story of Quiricus and Julitta as given in the later 'Acta.'

"The outer wall of the church on the side next the Palatine has retained its paintings in a fair state of preservation. The wall surface was divided into four bands; a dado representing hangings, a row of life-size saints, while the upper tiers were devoted to the Old Testament history, beginning, no doubt, with the Creation. Of the highest section all that has survived is the story of the Flood. On the lower we get the end of the life of Jacob and the history of Joseph as far as the fulfilment of the dreams of the chief butler and the baker. Probably the series was continued on the opposite side of the church, but the remains there are too scanty to enable us to say this with certainty. In the centre of the row of saints is a seated figure of our Lord. On His left are the saints of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Greek world: John Chrysostom, Gregory, Basil, Peter of Alexandria, Cyril, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Nicholas, Erasmus. The West, and especially Rome, is represented on His right: Clement, Silvester, Leo, Alexander, Valentine, Abundius (?), Euthymius, Sebastian (?), George, Gregory (the Great). The names are in Greek, whereas the inscriptions on the Old Testament scenes above are in Latin. Considerations of style make it probable that all this work was executed in the middle or latter half of the eighth century.

"The outer church or atrium was also completely covered with paintings, but mere fragments have survived. The best-preserved picture is that of a Madonna (inscribed *Maria Regina*), flanked by six sacred personages, of which the outer one on the left is a contemporary pope with the square nimbus. Unfortunately, all that can be certainly made out of his name is the termination 'anus.' A detached building outside the entrance to the church was apparently dedicated to the Forty Martyrs, who are represented in the apse as immersed in the lake, while on the left wall they appear as glorified with the Saviour in their midst.

"The church had not a long history. We learn from the *Book of the Popes* that in the middle of the ninth century Benedict III. (855–858) bestowed various offerings *in basilica beatæ Dei genetricis qui vocatur Antiqua quam a fundamentis Leo papa* (*i.e.*, his predecessor Leo IV.) *viam juxta sacram construxerat.* And once again, Nicholas I. (858–867) was the first to decorate with paintings this new Church of St. Mary, *que primitus Antiqua nunc autem Nova vocatur.* The new church is perfectly well known: it is S. Francesca Romana, built originally in part of the colonnade surrounding Hadrian's temple of Venus and Rome. The meaning is obvious. For some reason the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

diaconia of S. Maria Antiqua was transferred to a new site, where, for a time, it preserved its old name, until, as being a new construction, it got to be known popularly as 'New St. Mary's.' That reason can only have been some catastrophe which overwhelmed the original church. It was not fire, for there are no traces of fire in the building. But it may well have been that a day came when the towering structures at the north-west angle of the Palatine toppled over the edge of the hill and buried the church beneath their ruins. Natural decay is quite enough to have brought about this result, just as we know that in the time of Hadrian I. the Church of SS. Sergius and Bacchus was crushed beneath the falling ruins of the Temple of Concord. But perhaps we can localise the catastrophe more precisely. The *Book of the Popes* carefully records the occurrence of earthquakes in Rome. In the period with which we are concerned one took place under Leo III. (795–816), but apparently it was of minor importance and only affected seriously the basilica of St. Paul. But half a century later, under Leo IV., there was a terrible convulsion, *ita ut omnia elementa concussa viderentur ab omnibus*, and Leo IV. was the Pope who rebuilt S. Maria Antiqua on the new site in the Via Sacra. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here the cause of the abandonment of the old building."

Before leaving this interesting subject, it may be noted, from Federici's article, that traces of John's palace are to be seen in the remains of mediæval constructions by the side of S. Maria Antiqua, by the side of the apse of the chapel adjoining it, and close to the temple of Castor and Pollux and the sacred fountain of Juturna. Tiles of the Romano-Byzantine period have been found stamped with the name of John, †ΙΩΑΝΝ(ης). John, of course, may

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

have been the name of the maker; but it may have been that of the son of Plato, John VII.

John closed his short but 'full' reign in 707, and was buried[1] in St. Peter's, before the altar of the chapel of Our Lady, about which mention has been made. He died in the palace which he had himself built,[2] and which, before Mr. Rushforth's discovery, De Rossi had mistakenly identified with "certain ruins at the foot of the Palatine hill," which are to be seen on his right by anyone who walks from the Arch of Titus towards the Coliseum. His only epitaph was: "(The place) of John, the servant of Holy Mary."[3]

[1] *L. P.?* [2] *Ib.?* [3] Grisar, *Analecta*, i. 127, 167–8.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SISINNIUS.

A.D. 708.

Source.—The very short 'life' in the *L. P.*

EMPEROR OF THE EAST.	KING OF THE LOMBARDS.	EXARCH OF RAVENNA.
Justinian II. (restored), 705-711.	Aripert II., 700-712.	Theophylact, 702-709.

Sisinnius, Jan. 15, 708.

ALL that we know of this Pope, who only reigned twenty days, can be told in a few words. A Syrian, and the son of one John, he was consecrated on January 15 (a Sunday), 708. So afflicted was he with the gout that he could not feed himself. Still, says his biographer, he was[1] of firm mind, and had a care for the inhabitants of this city. Both these characteristics he displayed in the order which he gave to prepare lime for the restoration of the city walls. To this repairing of the walls he was doubtless moved, not merely by the nearer approach of the Lombards, but by fear of the rapidly-advancing power of the Saracens, and perhaps by a wish to strengthen the city against the arbitrary and often violent action of the emperors at Constantinople. Sudden death, however, prevented him

[1] *L. P.* "Constans animo, et curam agens pro habitatoribus hujus civitatis."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from carrying out his design. From the simple words, "Qui et calcarias pro restauratione murorum jussit decoquere," Dr. Hodgkin, in a style quite unworthy of the man himself and his work, takes occasion to remark,[1] "An evil precedent truly. How many of that silent population of statues which once made beautiful the terraces of Rome have perished in these same papal-like kilns?" No matter how willing Sisinnius might have been to make the 'silent population' defend the walls as well as the 'speaking population,' the fact is, as Dr. Hodgkin, himself quoting Gregorovius, observes in a note,[2] the great general Belisarius had practically got all the military service possible out of the 'silent population,' as his soldiers used them for various military purposes.

Sisinnius consecrated a bishop for Corsica, and was buried in St. Peter's, February 4, 708. Death of Sisinnius, Feb. 708.

Here one cannot but ask, Why were men in such a feeble state of health elected? Why was the city to be kept constantly in the state of excitement caused by elections? A healthy excitement indeed, if gratified at sufficiently remote intervals, but unhealthy if constant. For then either the excitement becomes feverish, or it plays itself out altogether; both which results are as injurious to states as to individuals. In the case of Sisinnius the answer to these queries may be, that the electors knew very well on the one hand that gout does not kill a man all at once; and on the other they may have had proof of the energy and strength of mind of their invalid candidate. The fact that Sisinnius at once made preparations to strengthen the city would serve to show[3] that he could read the times, and that he foresaw the troubles which the Lombards and then the Saracens were soon to

[1] *Italy*, etc., vi. [2] *Ib.*, v. 302.

[3] It shows, too, the temporal power he must have had in the city.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

bring on Rome and the popes. It may be, then, that Sisinnius was elected simply because he was an able and proper person, and because there was no suspicion that the gout had obtained the hold on him that it proved to have done.

On the other hand, there are not wanting authors who assert that the sole ground of his election was that he was an Oriental. They point to the fact that from John V., who was a Syrian, to Pope Zachary, who was a Greek, there was only one Western Pope, the Roman Gregory II. These authors believe that this succession of Orientals was brought about by the machinations of the exarchs, in the interests of their masters. If, however, such were indeed the case, it only remains to point out that once again history shows us 'man proposing but God disposing'; for these Oriental popes were very estimable men, a credit to the Papacy, and, as far as the records of history enable us to see, anything but creatures of the lords of Constantinople.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CONSTANTINE.

A.D. 708–715.

Sources.—A rather longer 'life' in the *L. P.* Bede and Malmesbury are the authorities for the Pope's relations with England. Agnellus of Ravenna (archbishop of Ravenna), who wrote the history of its bishops, about the middle of the ninth century, in a spirit hostile to the popes and in a very poor style, gives us some information about Ravennese affairs. His work is to be found in Muratori's *R. I. S.*, ii., and in the *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, edited by Holder-Egger.

Emperors of the East.	Kings of the Lombards.	Exarchs of Ravenna.
Justinian II. (Rhinotmetus), 705–711.	Aripert II., 700–712.	Theophylact, 702–709.[1]
Philippicus (Bardanes), 711–713.	Ausprand, 712.	John Rizocopus, 710–713.
Anastasius II., 713–715.	Liutprand, 712–744.	Scholasticus, 713–726.

Of Constantine we know nothing before he became Pope, except that, like his immediate predecessor (could he have been his brother?), he was a Syrian and the son

Constantine consecrated Pope, March 25, 708.

[1] It is granted that the dates for the exarchs of this period are very conjectural. All that is known with any degree of certainty with regard to the period of the rule of these exarchs is that it was in progress at the same time as that of those popes in connection with whom they (the exarchs) are mentioned by the papal biographers.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of John. 'The mildest of men,'[1] he was consecrated March 25, 708.

Felix of Ravenna, 708.

The first act that is recorded of Constantine is his consecrating Felix, the successor of Damian (consecrated by Sergius I.), as archbishop of Ravenna.

The subsequent conduct of Felix will be more readily understood if it be premised that it appears from the *Liber Diurnus* (formulas 73–4–5) that the bishops immediately dependent on the See of Rome (the suburbicarian bishops) had, after their consecration, to sign three formulas and give them into the hands of the Pope. The first, called 'promissio fidei,' was a detailed profession of faith, and had to be signed by the new bishop and his priests. The second, the 'cautio,' was an undertaking to observe certain rules of ecclesiastical government. It had to be dictated by the bishop to a notary, in presence of the primicerius and secundicerius of the notaries of the Roman Church, and then signed by the bishop and several witnesses. The third document, known as the 'indiculum' was a promise not to be connected with any undertaking against the unity of the Church or the security of the Roman empire. The 'indiculum' had to be written out by the bishop himself, and placed by him in the 'confession' of St. Peter.

Felix had no sooner received the desired consecration, than, thinking he had humbled himself quite enough by coming to Rome to be ordained, he refused to sign the accustomed acts of submission (*cautiones*) to the Holy See, *i.e.* probably, he refused to sign the second document just mentioned, the 'cautio' strictly so called. Backed by the secular power, "by the power of the judges,"[2] as

[1] "Vir valde mitissimus." *L. P.*

[2] "Sed per potentiam judicum exposuit ut voluit." *L. P.* We have here followed Duchesne literally.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the papal biographer expresses it, Felix refused to comply with the Pope's demands. The parchment, however, on which the 'indiculum' had been duly written, was placed by the Pope himself in the 'confession' of St. Peter. And we have it on the authority of the same historian that, a few days after, it was found all black, and, as it were, scorched. In the sacking and partial burning of the city of Ravenna (in the following year, 709) by the troops of Justinian, the papal biographer sees the hand of God punishing its people and archbishop for their pride in wishing to be more independent of the Pope. Why Justinian treated Ravenna in this manner cannot be precisely ascertained. According to Agnellus it was because some of the Ravennese had taken part in the rebellion against him in 695.[1] At any rate, it is certain that he put to death all the chief men of the city, deprived Archbishop Felix of his sight, and sent him into exile somewhere in Pontus, very likely to Cherson. However, when Justinian finished his violent career by a violent death (711), the poor sightless archbishop was allowed to return to his See. Humbled by his terrible sufferings, Felix submitted to the Pope, sent, of his own free will, the required 'oath of obedience' (*cautio*), and died (723) in communion with the See of Rome.[2]

[1] Other motives are suggested by Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 709; Hodgkin, *Italy*, etc., vi. 372.

[2] "Felix . . . . ab exilio reductus, pœnitentia motus, licet oculorum lumine privatus, tamen ad propriam rediit sedem. Et solita quæ ab universis in scrinio Episcoporum fiunt indicula, et fidei expositionem et hic confessus est, sicque reconciliationis promeruit absolutionem." *L. P. Cf.* Agnellus, in his life of Felix; he is, however, silent on the subject of the differences between Felix and the Pope. From his epitaph (ap. Agnel. in vit., c. 7) it would appear that on his return he not only made his submission, but acted in thorough harmony with the Holy See:

"Culmen apostolicum colere summe novit
Cujus ope fretus profana dogmata pell(i)t."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Kings Coenred and Offa in Rome, 709.

The example of Caedwalla, king of the West Saxons, who, as we have seen, resigned his kingdom and went to Rome to die, was followed, twenty years after, by two other Anglo-Saxon kings. Coenred, "who had for some time (704–709) very nobly governed the kingdom of the Mercians," says Bede,[1] "did a much more noble act by quitting the throne of his kingdom and going to Rome (after May 709), where, having received the tonsure, when Constantine was Pope, and been made a monk at the shrine of the apostles, he continued to his last hours in prayer, fastings, and alms-deeds. . . . With him went the son of Sighere, king of the East Saxons, whose name was Offa, a youth of most lovely age and beauty, and most earnestly desired by all his nation to be their king. He, with like devotion, quitted his (betrothed) wife, lands, kindred and country, for Christ and for the gospel, that he might receive a hundredfold in this life and in the next life everlasting (St. Matt. xix. 29). He also . . . . receiving the tonsure and adopting a monastic life, attained the long-wished-for sight of the blessed apostles in heaven."

Ecgwin of Worcester

With them, and at their request, there went to Rome, for the second[2] time, Ecgwin, the famous bishop of Worcester.

[1] *H. E.*, v. 19 (Eng. trans., p. 520). "Coinred qui regno Merciorum nobilissime tempore aliquanto præfuit, nobilius multo sceptra regni reliquit. . . . Offa juvenis amantissimæ ætatis et venustatis . . . . ad tenenda . . . . regni sceptra exoptatissimus . . . . reliquit uxorem," etc. *Cf.* v. 20, ad an. 709. Coenred was particularly moved (maxime miserando exitu militis compunctus. Malms., *De Gest. Reg. Ang.*, i. § 78) to give up the world by witnessing one of his knights die in despair, after refusing to confess his sins when sickness had fallen on him, "lest his companions should upbraid him with having done that for fear of death, which he had refused to do in health" (Bede, *H. E.*, v. 13). *Cf. L. P.*

[2] Ecgwin had been bishop from 692 (692–717).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

To get at the truth with regard to the history of Ecgwin is well-nigh impossible. The biographies[1] of him which we possess do not go back beyond the tenth or eleventh centuries; and the royal charters[2] and papal letters which concern him are, for the most part, regarded as forgeries. However, of the chief facts of his life there is no reason to doubt. Most of them are vouched for by his charter of foundation of the abbey of Evesham (714), which has been preserved[3] for us by one of his biographers, Prior Dominic. And of this charter Mr Macray, the editor of Dominic's *Life* for the Rolls series, writes (p. xx): "The version (of Ecgwin's charter) in our text claims so decidedly to be a transcript, "paene verbum ex verbo, sicut ipsemet vir sanctus in cartis suis ex maxima parte scribendo est prosequutus," that its genuineness, as a whole, can only be disputed either by accusing the prior of a deliberate forgery, or by imputing to him an almost incredible ignorance of the age and character of the document which he used."

Ecgwin's first visit to Rome was the more romantic. His people, finding that he never ceased denouncing their evil ways, contrived to bring upon him the displeasure both of Rome and the king. To Rome, then, was he summoned. To show how he was bound by accusations,

[1] The anonymous life in the Bollandists (*Acta SS.*, Jan. 1, 707 f.) is thought to date from the eleventh century. It is the one used by Prior Dominic—he was prior in 1125—in compiling his life of Ecgwin, which takes up the first part of the *Chron. Abbat. de Evesham* (Rolls Series). There is an earlier and independent life, which, without any reason, is said to have been written by Brithwald, which has not yet been printed, but of which fragments are given in the *Acta SS.*, *ib.*, p. 711, and in the preface to the Rolls ed. of the *Chron. de E.* This biography may be as early as the tenth century.

[2] Ap. Kemble, *Codex Diplom. Evi Sax.*, i. 68 f.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 281 f.

[3] *Chron. E.*, 17 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

we are told that he fastened fetters on himself and threw the key of them into the Avon. Though thus impeded, Rome was reached at last. A fish caught in the Tiber was found to contain the key of Ecgwin's fetters! Taking this marvel as a sign from heaven, Ecgwin freed himself from his chains. Then by the Pope also was he declared innocent of the charges brought against him, and by his authority was he restored to his see.[1]

The second time he went to Rome was, as we have seen, in the company of kings.

His eleventh century biographer relates that, while at Rome on this occasion, Ecgwin consulted the Pope about a vision that he had seen, in which he was directed to build a church in the midst of a wild country, the site of the present town of Evesham, where there was a "bit of a chapel (*ecclesiolam*), probably the work," says Malmesbury,[2] "of the Britons." The Pope, in full belief of the genuineness of the vision, wrote[3] (709) to the archbishop of Canterbury (Brithwald), and ordered a council to be held on the spot where Ecgwin had seen the vision of Our Lady, and a Benedictine monastery to be built there. In the 'Lateran church of Our Saviour,' whence the letter of the Pope and the supposed charters of the kings are

[1] "Controversiæ suæ et itineris causa . . . . coram summo pontifice recitata, discussa . . . . apostolica benedictione et litteris ad sedem propriam regressus est." (Ancient life in the Bollandists.)

[2] "Constat . . . . locum illum, quo nunc cœnobium visitur, peculiariter amasse, incultum antea et spinetis horridum, sed ecclesiolam ab antiquo habentem, ex opere forsitan Britannorum." Malms., *De Gest. Pont.*, iv. (ed. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 179, p. 1597).

[3] See the letter, ap. Haddan and Stubbs. In confirmation of the gifts of the kings, Constantine wrote: "Ipsum locum, quem regia potestas donavit, et nos, auctoritate Dei et SS. App. et nostra, donamus" (*Acta SS.*, Jan., p. 709). The two letters of Constantine, printed in Haddan and Stubbs (iii. 281–3), are there set down as spurious.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

dated, the two kings, whom the saint had conducted to Rome, gave large grants, it is said, towards the expenses of the new church and monastery, in presence of the Pope and a great number of Anglo-Saxon bishops and nobles. The saint returned with great joy to England. The monastery of Evesham was begun at once; and in 713 a bull[1] of Pope Constantine placed it under the special protection of Archbishop Brithwald, and declared it 'free from all tyrannical exaction.'

From this history of Ecgwin, if we conclude only that he made two journeys to Rome in the days of Pope Constantine, and obtained a 'privilege of exemption' from that Pontiff for his monastery of Evesham, we shall certainly not err on the side of credulity.

The Pope sets out for the East, Oct. 5, 709.

Towards the close of the year 709,[2] Constantine left the harbour of Portus for Constantinople, in obedience to an order from Justinian, who thought to settle the 'Quinisext question' more quickly by word of mouth than by diplomatic correspondence.

As this journey of the Pope is interesting from various points of view, it seems worth while to give it at the same length as it has been given to us by the papal biographer. There accompanied the Pope two bishops, three priests, Gregory the deacon, afterwards the great Pope Gregory II., the secundicerius,[3] the first of the 'defensors,' or agents, the (private) treasurer, the nomenclator, the keeper of the archives (*scrinarius*), two subdeacons, and a few inferior

[1] Ap. Haddan and Stubbs, *Conc.*, iii.; Mansi, etc. *Cf. Chron. Wigorn.*, ad an. 708. See Flanagan, *History of the Church of England*, i. pp. 143–5; Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, Jan. 11.

[2] *L. P.* Some readings give 'Indictione ix.,' which would give us 710 instead of 709.

[3] Note that Constantine takes the 'secundicerius.' Hence the Roman See was still governed in the absence of the Pope by the archpriest, the archdeacon and the primicerius of the notaries.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

clerics. At Naples the Pope was met by the exarch John, who, on leaving the Pope, went to Rome, and, for some reason quite unknown to us, proceeded to decapitate four officials of the papal court—the majordomo, the treasurer, the ordinator and an abbot. Passing on to Ravenna, he met with a most shameful death, a just reward, as the Pope's biographer thinks, of his great crimes. Meanwhile the Pope sailed on to Otranto, touching at Sicily, Reggio, Cotrone and Gallipoli, in Calabria.[1] At Otranto, where he passed the winter, he was visited by the *Regionarius* Theophanius, who brought with him an imperial mandate,[2] to the effect that, wherever the Pope touched in the course of his journey, he was to be received by the judges as though he were the emperor. When the winter was over the Pope sailed to Constantinople by way of the island of Ceos. To the seventh milestone from the city went forth the populace in their holiday attire to meet the Pope. At their head were the emperor's young son Tiberius and the nobility, with the patriarch Cyrus and his clergy. Mounted on beautifully caparisoned horses from the imperial stables, the Pope wearing his mitre (*camelaucum*),[3] the papal party were escorted in triumph to the palace of Placidia. This palace, the usual residence of the papal apocrisiarii when at Constantinople, stood where once stood old Byzantium, and where now stands the old Seraglio, and so was beautifully situated at the eastern end of the promontory

[1] From letters of St. Gregory I. (ix. 205-6, al. 99-100), it appears that there was at Gallipoli a *massa Callipolitana* belonging to the Roman Church.

[2] "Dum Hydronto moras faceret, ... suscepit sigillum imperiale per Theophanium Regionarium, continentem ita, ut ubi conjungeret Pontifex, omnes judices ita eum honorifice susciperent, quasi ipsum præsentialiter Imperatorem viderent." *L. P.*

[3] It has been observed that the author of the *False Donation of Constantine* has drawn upon this description of Pope Constantine's entry into Constantinople.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which separates the Sea of Marmora from the Golden Horn, commanding a view of the Asiatic coast. Justinian, who was then at Nicæa in Bithynia, at once wrote to the Pope to express his joy and thankfulness for his coming, and begged him to come as far as Nicomedia. Thither the emperor made his way; and there, with the imperial crown upon his head, he prostrated himself before the Pope on his arrival and kissed his feet.[1] Then, whilst all admired the emperor's humility, the Pope and emperor embraced. On Sunday the emperor received Holy Communion at the hands of the Pope; and whilst praying the Pope to intercede for his sins, he renewed[2] all the privileges of the Church. As to what passed between Justinian and the Pope in the course of their conversation, the biographer of the latter gives us no further information in his *Life* of Constantine. But it is the general opinion of historians, supported by what will be immediately cited from the life of Gregory II., that the two discussed the Quinisext Council. By the aid of his deacon Gregory, the Pope succeeded in satisfying the emperor without compromising his See. "When questioned by the emperor on certain chapters," says Gregory's (II.) biographer,[3] "he (Gregory) solved every difficulty by his admirable answers." As Héfélé remarks,[4] Constantine took the middle course which we know that John VIII. afterwards took,[5] *i.e.*, he approved those canons of the Trullan synod which were

[1] "Augustus . . . . cum regno in capite sese prostravit, pedes osculans Pontificis." *L. P. Cf.* V. Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 714.

[2] "Omnia privilegia Ecclesiæ renovavit." *L. P.*, and Bede, *l.c.*

[3] "A Justiniano . . . . inquisitus de quibusdam capitulis, optima responsione unamquamque solvit quæstionem." *L. P.* in vit. Greg. II.

[4] *Hist. Conc.*, v. p. 240, Engl. ed.

[5] *Cf.* the preface of the librarian Anastasius to his translation of the Acts of the Seventh Gen. Council, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not opposed to the faith, good morals, or the decrees of the Roman Church.

Return of the Pope to Rome, Oct. 711.

Despite a great deal of sickness on his return journey, the Pope reached Rome (October 24, 711) in safety, to the great joy of the people.

Soon after the Pope's arrival in Rome, the bloodthirsty Justinian, whom the papal biographer, on the principle, it would seem, that one ought to speak of men as one finds them, calls 'orthodox and most Christian,' was slain, and Philippicus (Bardanes), a heretic, reigned in his stead![1] The first thing that this 'luxurious and extravagant'[2] prince did was to attempt to revive the Monothelite heresy! By so doing, remarks Finlay,[3] "he increased the confusion into which the empire had fallen (by the frequent revolutions that had occurred from the date of the first accession of Justinian II.), and exposed the total want of character and conscience among the Greek clergy, by re-establishing the Monothelite doctrines in a general council of the Eastern bishops" (712 A.D.). The letter which he sent to the Pope was replete with heresy. Examined in a synod[4] at Rome, the imperial document was condemned by the Pope. The Roman people also took up the question; and by their conduct retorted in a very direct manner on the action of Bardanes. For one of the first acts of the emperor had been[5] to order the

Fall of Justinian and accession of Philippicus, 711.

Philippicus tries to revive Monothelism.

[1] *L. P. Cf.* Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 714, and Paul. Diac., *Hist. Langobard*, vi. 31, who says that it was against "the urgent expostulations of the Apostolic Pope" that Justinian "sent an army to Pontus to apprehend Philippicus." See Hodgkin, vi. p. 379 f.

[2] So he is called by Finlay, *Hist. of the Byz. Emp.*, i. p. 395.

[3] *Ib. Cf.* Theop., *Chron.*, ad an. 703, 704; Nicephorus and the *Libell. Synod.*, ap. Mansi, xii.

[4] "Cujus (Philippici) sacram cum pravi dogmatis exaratione Constantinus suscepit, sed cum Apostolicæ sedis consilio respuit." *L. P.* in vit. *Cf. Hist. Langob.*, vi. 34; and Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 716.

[5] *Cf. Peroral. Agathonis Diac.*, ap. Mansi, xii. 192; and Paul and Bede, *l.c.* As we learn from this very 'peroration,' or epilogue, first

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

removal of a representation of the Sixth General Council, which had been hanging for some years in the vestibule of the palace, and, on the other hand, he had decreed the reinsertion into the diptychs of the names of those who had been condemned by the Sixth General Council and the re-erection of their images. The acts of the Sixth Council he had caused to be burnt and its supporters exiled. Accordingly Pope and people[1] proceeded to erect in the portico of St. Peter's a series of pictures illustrative of the six general councils. They then went a step further, a step equivalent to declaring themselves independent, at least of an heretical emperor. They decreed that the name of Philippicus should not appear in their charters, nor be stamped on their money. His image was not placed in the church, nor was he prayed for in the Canon of the Mass.[2] After this, what need for surprise when, after further provocation, we find the Roman people making themselves wholly independent of the emperor and placing themselves under the rule of the Pope; and if we find under Zachary, if not under one of the Gregorys (II. or III.), the Pope's name on the coins of the Roman people instead of the emperor's!

Of course the emperor could not tamely submit to see all this defiance of his authority, and he sent (713) a certain Peter to replace the Duke Christopher,[3] who had connived at all these doings. The people, however, took

published by Combefis, Agatho, whilst a young man, had been one of the assistant secretaries of the Sixth General Council.

[1] *L. P.*; and Paul and Bede, *l.c.*

[2] *L. P.* *Cf.* Bede, *l.c.*, and Paul, *l.c.*, who says, "Statuit populus Romanus, ne hæretici imperatoris nomen, aut chartas, aut figuram solidi, susciperent."

[3] This is the first mention of a 'Duke' and a 'Duchy' of Rome. "Dux, ducatus Romæ." *L. P.* The Duke Peter was finally driven out of Rome in the following reign. See p. 293.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Christopher's part, and a fight took place in the Via Sacra, in front of the official residence of the governor of Rome, between what was known as the 'Christian' party and Agatho, who had come to Rome to represent Peter. Several had been killed on both sides, when the Pope, to prevent further bloodshed, sent down to the combatants a body of priests bearing the Book of the Gospels and the Crucifix. They prevailed on the 'Christian' party, which was far the stronger, to yield. The triumph of the heretical party was, however, short-lived; for news reached Rome, a few days after the combat, that the heretic Philippicus had been deposed,[1] and that the orthodox Anastasius reigned in his stead. "Then," says the papal biographer from whom we learn these facts, "great was the joy of the orthodox, while black night[2] fell upon the heretic."

With their imperial sympathies the popes ought to have been the last persons with whom any emperor should have quarrelled. This the new emperor, Anastasius, understood and, by the hands of his exarch Scholasticus, sent the Pope a profession of faith, in which he declared his orthodoxy and consequent adhesion to the Sixth General Council. The patriarch John, also, who had been forcibly placed in the See of Constantinople by Philippicus, sent a profession of faith to Constantine (whom he calls the head of the Christian priesthood), in which he endeavoured to make out that he had always really been orthodox at heart, but had acted as he had done to ward off greater evils from the Church. And he maintained that the decree of faith drawn up at the

[1] Philippicus was dethroned by a sudden rising of the soldiers, and blinded on Whitsunday eve, 713. *Cf.* Theop. in *Chron.*, ad an. 705.

[2] A night from which Monothelism has never emerged. *Cf. Life of Honorius* for the beginnings of Monothelism.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

pseudo-council of Philippicus was orthodox in sense, if not at first sight in words. As a sole comment upon this, let it suffice to point out that it was conduct of the same weak kind on the part of our own bishops under Henry VIII. that brought about the so-called 'Reformation' and all the evils, social and religious—notably the Civil War—that it has produced in England. The exarch or the '*Roman people*' suffered Peter to receive the dukedom of Rome on condition of his promising not to molest any of his opponents.[1]

Benedict of Milan.

With Muratori, we may refer to this year the action of the holy[2] archbishop of Milan, Benedict. It would seem that of old, certainly in the fifth century, the church of Pavia had been subject to that of Milan. For some cause the right of the archbishops of Milan had been lost; perhaps because the Lombard kings had obtained exemption for the bishops of their capital from the jurisdiction of Milan. And so when it was shown to Benedict, who wished to recover the rights of Milan, that for a long time the bishops of Pavia had been consecrated at Rome, and had been subject only to its jurisdiction, he waived his contentions once and for all.

Death of Constantine, 715.

After the year 713 we know nothing more of the life of Constantine. When, in conclusion, it is stated that in his time, as in the time of Pharao, there was a season of extraordinary scarcity and one of extraordinary plenty, and that he consecrated a great many bishops both when

[1] *L. P.*, Bede and Paul, *ubi sup.* The letter of the patriarch John is to be found in the peroration or epilogue of the deacon Agatho, in Mansi, xii., etc. John (speaking of the Pope) says that what the head is to the whole body, that 'the apostolical pre-eminence' of the Pope is to the whole Church; and that "according to the canons, he is the head of the Christian priesthood" (κεφαλὴν τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν ἱερωσύνης κανονικῶς ὑμας λογιζόμενοι).

[2] "De quo per universam Italiam bonæ opinionis fama flagravit." Paulus, vi. 29. *Cf. L. P.*; Muratori, *Ann.*, ad an. 713.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

going to and when returning from Constantinople, and at other times, practically all has here been said that is known of this "worthy predecessor[1] of the greater popes under whom Rome effected her emancipation from the yoke of Byzantium."

Constantine was buried in St. Peter's, April 9, 715.

[1] Gregorovius, ii. 212.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. GREGORY II.

A.D. 715–731.

Sources.—A contemporary and rather full life in the *L. P.* is our chief source. There were originally two editions of the biography of Gregory II. The second one seems to have been drawn up during the pontificate of Pope Zachary (*cf.* Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. p. ccxx f.). In Duchesne's edition of the *L. P.* the two editions are printed in parallel columns, the one on the left being apparently the older and strictly contemporary edition. As Bede uses the biography of Gregory, which passed into the *L. P.*, the biography must have been partially written in Gregory's lifetime; for Bede's *De sex ætat.*, finished in 729, contains extracts from it (the biography). Then we have a number of the Pope's letters. In addition, there are the Histories and Chronicles of Paul the Deacon, Bede, Theophanes, already mentioned, and that of Andrea Dandolo (Doge of Venice, 1343–1354), who preserved earlier documents, ap. *R. I. S.*, xii. By Balzani we are told that Dandolo was "deeply versed in jurisprudence and history," and that his chronicle "is an excellent work, for which he made use of every kind of materials; and it embraces the whole history of Venice, collected with great diligence and learning." Written while he was Doge, he had, of course, every facility for consulting the State archives; and had the other authors of Venetian history perished, "Dandolo would have preserved the pith of the earlier works, and the history of Venice would have come down to us the same." Another Venetian author will also be now of use to us, viz., John the Deacon. This is not the biographer of Pope Gregory the Great, who was known as *Hymonides*, but the one who used to be quoted as *Sagorninus*, and who was the chaplain of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Doge Pietro Orseolo (991–1009). His *Chronicle*, starting from the first dawn of Venetian history, extends to the year 1008. It is to be found ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 139; and *M. G. SS.*, iii. The latest edition is by Monticolo, Roma, 1890. Of the first importance are the letters of St. Boniface (†755). They have been edited three or four times from the early seventeenth century edition of Serarius to the beautiful edition of Dümmler, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii., 1892. As supplying us with many facts with regard to the Iconoclast controversy, the life of St. Stephen, the younger, by the deacon Stephen is very valuable. Stephen wrote in 809, forty-two years after the death of his namesake. His life is printed in the *Analecta Græca*, i., of Montfaucon. St. John Damascene's († *c.* 787) *Treatise on Images*, of which there exists an English translation by Miss Allies, (Baker, 1898), is useful for the theological side of the Iconoclast controversy.

Modern works.—Of the greatest value is Héfélé's *History of the Councils*, vol. v. (Eng. trans.). Doellinger's essay on Gregory II., in his *Papstfabeln* (French trans. by Reinhard, p. 129 f.), shows the attitude of the Pope to the Greek emperor. On the policy of Leo, the Isaurian, read Finlay's *Byzantine Empire*; Bury's *History of the Later Roman Empire*, ii.; and Hodgkin's *Italy*, vi., all very favourably disposed to the Iconoclast emperors, but thought by many Catholic authors to follow too closely the prejudiced work of Schlosser, *Geschichte der Bilderstürmenden Kaiser.*

Emperors of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarchs of Ravenna.
Anastasius II., 713–715.	Liutprand, 712–744.	Scholasticus, 713–726.
Theodosius III., 715–716.[1]		Paul, 726–727.
Leo III., 716[1]–741.		Eutychius, 727–752; apparently the last of the exarchs.

Difficulty and importance of the *life* of Gregory II.

UNDER any circumstances the *life* of Gregory II. is beset with difficulties. But to the Christian historian,

[1] The date generally assigned to these events is 717. In giving 716, Héfélé (v. p. 301, Eng. trans.), who was guided by Nicephorus, has been followed. Nicephorus (*Chron.*) gives twenty-five years

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

who approaches it with a wish to be impartial, the biography of that Pontiff presents exceptional difficulties. The principles—from whatever source drawn, from education, natural temperament, and the rest—which he brings to the examination of the 'Image-breaking' (Iconoclast) heresy, and of the 'temporal power of the popes,' are naturally calculated to make him draw conclusions about the conduct of St. Gregory in accordance with those principles. The historian with rationalistic or 'Puritan' leanings will, of course, look askance at the great defender of 'image-worship.' The opponent of government by clerics will decry the great Pontiff under whom the temporal rule of the popes may be said to have fairly begun.

The difficulties, however, that meet the biographer of Gregory II., in any case, are caused by the unsatisfactory nature of some of the records of his time that have come down to us. We can gather from them little or nothing of the *motives* that actuated the chief figures on the world's stage in those times; *e.g.*, *why* Leo, after a reign of ten years, began to persecute the worshippers of images. There is also a lamentable want of reliable dates in the period under consideration, and there is much controversy as to the genuineness of some of its most important documents, *e.g.*, the two famous letters of the Pope to the emperor. The Greek historians are so badly informed on Western affairs as to confuse the two Gregorys; the Latins relate events which seem scarcely to be consistent. All this, of course, tells strongly in favour of the prejudiced writer. He can arrange his facts to suit his theories

three months and fourteen days as the length of the reign of Leo III. He counts from the time Leo was proclaimed emperor in the camp. Hence, with Héfélé, we suppose that Leo reigned from March 5, 716, to June 18, 741.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with less fear of contradiction. And as the pontificate of Gregory II. is very important, this is the more unfortunate. Under the circumstances, then, all that can be done for the benefit of the reader is to make every effort to lay before him the sequence of events in the plainest terms, so that he can judge for himself of the merits of the personages that will be brought under his notice.

Similarity between the *lives* of Gregory I. and Gregory II.

At the outset it is interesting to call attention to the resemblance between the histories of the first two Gregorys. Both reigned for about the same number of years, and both were reigning in the beginning of their respective centuries. Both of noble families, they turned their parental mansions into monasteries, and both acted as secretaries of the popes, their immediate predecessors. Both, in their struggles with the Lombards, subdued them at the last by their personal influence, and both were prepared for their dealings with the emperors of Byzantium by a personal knowledge of the Eastern court. If, in the history of the conversion of nations, the name of St. Augustine and England is inseparably linked with that of the first Gregory, the second Gregory is just as closely allied with St. Boniface and Germany. And finally, from the extracts of his *registers*[1] which have come down to us, it would appear that the second Gregory might also, like the first, be set down as a careful administrator of the 'patrimony of St. Peter.'

Early life of Gregory.

To proceed to the details of Gregory's life. He was, again like his great namesake, a Roman, the son of Marcellus and Honesta. It was after her death[2] that Gregory, then Pope, transformed the ancestral mansion

[1] In the abstracts compiled by Deusdedit, a cardinal of the eleventh century, and given by Jaffé in his *Regesta*.

[2] "Moribus certe Honesta et nomine," quaintly observes his biographer.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

into a monastery in honour of St. Agatha, *in Suburra*, endowed it and enriched it with many precious vessels for the service of the altar. When very young, he was placed under the care of the popes, and was by Pope Sergius made subdeacon and treasurer of the Roman See. He was then entrusted with the care of the papal library,[1] and made deacon. In the *Life* of Constantine we saw the part he played, in the latter capacity, in the affair of the Quinisext canons with Justinian II.

He was a man of pure life, eloquent and firm, had a good knowledge of the sacred Scriptures, and ever showed himself a stout upholder of the rights of the Church (*res ecclesiasticæ*) and a formidable foe to his opponents.[2] Such was the man who was consecrated bishop of Rome, May 19, 715. Gregory Pope.

Whether or not because he could see that the Lombards, after their long period of rest, were about to make another effort to bring all the Italian peninsula under their yoke, or because he felt that danger from the Saracens was imminent,[3] Gregory, in the very first year of his pontificate, commenced to repair the walls of Rome, beginning at the gate of St. Lawrence. But various circumstances (among others, probably, an unusual rising of the Tiber, about October 716, which did great damage in Rome, lasting for eight days, and which only subsided after many Litanies had Repairs the walls of Rome.

[1] "Bibliothecæ illi est cura commissa." *L. P.* Gregory is the first treasurer (sacellarius) and librarian of the Roman See mentioned by name.

[2] "Vir castus, divinæ scripturæ eruditus, facundus loquela, et constans animo," etc. *Ib.* He was known to the Romans as Gregory the younger, and to the Greeks as 'Dialogus'; confusing him with St. Gregory I., the author of the *Dialogues*.

[3] One of the correspondents of St. Boniface, writing from Rome (c. 725), advises that his friend Bugga should not come to Rome, "donec rebelliones et temptationes et minæ Sarracenorum, quæ apud Romanos nuper emerserunt, conquieverint." Ep. 27, *M. G. H.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

been said by the order of the Pope) prevented Gregory from completing their entire restoration.[1] The last days of a state have come when it has to depend for its existence on stone walls! Well was it for Rome in the eighth century that it had in the person of its bishops a defence stronger than barred gate or turret!

Overflow of the Tiber, 716.

In connection with the overflow of the Tiber just mentioned, Duchesne has a very useful topographical note, which we cannot do better than translate. After observing that this is the first time that an inundation caused by the Tiber is described by any of the papal biographers, he calls attention to the fact that, whenever an overflow of the Tiber is chronicled by later writers in the *Liber Pontificalis*, it is always in the same words as those used in this life of Gregory II. Nor is there any objection to this, as the phenomenon always repeats itself in the same way. Striking against the north wall of the city, the river rushed in by the only opening on that side, viz., the Flaminian Gate. Unable, as it swept along, to effect an entrance by the openings which lead to the Pons Aelius (St. Angelo) and the Pons Aurelius (Ponte Sisto), owing to their height above the river, it nevertheless managed to force its way through the postern gates and up the water-courses and other smaller openings. Thence it spread over the Campus Martius. Along the Via Lata it rushed to the foot of the Capitol and to the basilica of St. Mark. Here it had to make a bend; and here it was that the water seems to have attained its maximum height, and here was the height of the inundation measured. On the left bank of the river the flood covered the Neronian fields

[1] *L. P.*; Paul., *De Gest. L.*, vi. 36; Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 720. "A Domno itaque Papal ætaniæ crebro fiebant," says the *L. P.*, which also tells us that the water was over eight feet deep in the Via Lata, "ad unam et semis staturam."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from the *porta Sti. Petri*, near the castle of St. Angelo, to the Milvian Bridge (Ponte Molle). In the other direction, viz., towards St. Peter's, the flood stopped at a place called *Remissa*, which is spoken of in the first *Ordo Romanus* of Mabillon as a place where the cortege of the Pope halted for a moment on its way to St. Peter's on Easter Monday. As, in the twelfth century, this halt, we know, was made in front of the steps which led to the atrium of the basilica (before the church of St. Maria of the *Virgarii*), *i.e.*, where now stands the obelisk, it may be argued that there was the *remissa* of the eighth and ninth centuries.

John, and St. Germanus of Constantinople, 715.

In this same year (715) also, Gregory received a profession of faith (a synodical letter) from the 'prudent' John, patriarch of Constantinople, whom we have seen truckling to the Monothelite emperor Philippicus. This lengthy letter, of which mention has already been made, and which had been directed to Constantine, John styled an *apology*, inasmuch as it was largely taken up with specious efforts to palliate his weakness. He had to yield somewhat, he urged, to the character of the man (viz., the emperor). After a tedious and confused endeavour to clear himself as far as possible, John concluded by assuring the Pope, 'God-inspired, θεόληπτος,' as he called him, that he is now, on the one hand, in possession of his defence, and, on the other, of his profession of the orthodox faith. And he earnestly begs the Pope not to be severe with him, as he had acted under constraint.

In the eighth century, then, the Pope of Rome, even to the patriarchs of Constantinople, was *the sacred head* of the church (ὦ ἱερὰ κεφαλή), whose office it was to direct and govern all the other members of the church without exception, just as, in the human frame, the power of controlling the other parts of the body proceeds from the head. This document, so interesting in many ways, may be read in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Labbe (*Concil.*, vi. 1407 f.), or in any of the great editions of the councils. It was one of the documents the deacon Agatho thought fit to append to the acts of the Sixth General Council, at which he had been present. Gregory sent his profession[1] in return. John probably did not live to receive it. For on the 11th of August,[2] Germanus, who had been bishop of Cyzicus, was transferred to the vacant patriarchal See of Constantinople, and was installed in the presence, among others, of "the most holy priest Michael, apocrisiarius of the Apostolic See." He was soon, by his heroism in resisting the tyranny of the Iconoclast Leo, to atone for his weakness under the Monothelite Philippicus.

Anglo-Saxon pilgrims to Rome, 716.

The number of Anglo-Saxon pilgrims to Rome, which throughout the whole of the seventh and eighth centuries was large, was particularly great during the life of Gregory II. "At this time[3] many of the Angles, noble and simple, men and women, soldiers and private persons, moved by the instinct of divine love, were wont to repair from Britain to Rome." The two most illustrious names among the English pilgrims of this period were those of Abbot Ceolfrid and King Ina. Ceolfrid had been the specially beloved disciple of the great abbot Benedict Biscop, had accompanied Benedict in his journeys to Rome in search of books and treasures of all kinds, had been appointed by him abbot of the monastery of St. Paul, on the north bank of the Wear, and, after the death of Benedict, had presided over the twin monasteries of SS. Peter and Paul for twenty-eight years. Being then very old, he decided to revisit Rome, "where he had been in his youth with Benedict, to the end that, before his death, he might have some

[1] *L. P.*

[2] Theoph., *Chron.*, ad an. 707.

[3] Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 720. *Cf. ib.*, *H. E.*, v. 7. "Quod (*i.e.*, Romam ire) his temporibus plures de gente Anglorum, nobiles, ignobles, laici, clerici, viri ac feminæ certatim facere consuerunt."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

relaxation for a while from the cares of the world"; and that his brethren might have the benefit of a younger and more energetic abbot. In tears the monks heard of the determination of their beloved abbot. And as nothing could shake the resolve of the aged man, they elected Huethbert as his successor. In the whole range of monastic history—one is almost tempted to say in the whole range of general history—there is nothing more touching than the narrative of the resignation, departure for Rome, and death of the abbot Ceolfrid, whether it be read in the simple original of Venerable Bede,[1] or in the glowing pages of the historian of the *Monks of the West*.[2] Ceolfrid took with him to Rome a complete copy of the Bible as a gift to the Church of St. Peter, and a letter from the new abbot 'to the apostolic Pope Gregory,' which began as follows: "To the thrice-blessed Pope Gregory, his most beloved lord in the Lord of lords, Huethbert, your most humble servant, ... wishes eternal health in the Lord. I, together with the brethren, who desire in these places to find rest for their souls by carrying the easy yoke of Christ, cease not to render thanks to the providence of the heavenly judge, that he has thought fit to appoint you, who are such a glorious vessel of election, to be the ruler of the Church Universal in our times; and by means of the light of truth and faith with which you are filled, to disperse the beams of his love among your inferiors." He proceeds to recommend to the Pope's care 'the venerable grey hairs' of their dear Ceolfrid.[3] Such was the language of English churchmen of the eighth century to the Vicar of Christ.

[1] *Cf.* his *Lives of the abbots Benedict, Easterwine and Ceolfrid*; and *De sex ætat.*, ad an. 720.

[2] Montalembert, iv. 464 f.

[3] Bede, *Lives of the Abbots of Wearmouth*, § 19, Eng. trans. "Quod te nostris temporibus tam glorificum electionis vas regimini totius ecclesiæ præficere dignatus est."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Ceolfrid was not destined again to see at Rome "the shrines which it was to him a cause of unceasing joy to remember and repeat that he had seen and adored in his youth."[1] He died at Langres, September 25, 716.

Ina, the great and powerful king of Wessex, was more fortunate in accomplishing his pilgrimage. After a glorious reign of thirty-seven years, he went to Rome (725 or 726), "being desirous to spend some time of his pilgrimage upon earth in the neighbourhood of holy places, that he might be more easily received by the saints into heaven."[2] According to Malmesbury,[3] Ina passed his time in Rome in retirement and in obscurity, clad in the garb of an ordinary citizen, in order that he might not be seen of men. Later writers, however, will have it that he spent part of his time in Rome in founding 'the school of the English.' Matthew Paris, who flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century, tells us[4] that Ina "built a house in the city with the consent and goodwill of Pope Gregory, which he called the school of the English, to which the kings of England, the royal family, and the clergy might come to be instructed in the Catholic faith, that nothing false or contrary to the Catholic faith might be taught in the Church in England." In this narrative of Paris there is

[1] Bede, *Lives of the Abbots of Wearmouth*, § 19, Eng. trans., Stevenson.

[2] Bede, *H. E.*, v. 7. *Cf. A.-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 728, and Lingard, *Hist. of England*, i. c. 3.

[3] *De Gest. Reg.*, i. § 37, ed. Migne. "Non publicis vultibus expositus . . . . amictu plebeio tectus."

[4] Ad an. 727. Lingard shows that it can scarcely be maintained with the same author, that Ina was the first of our kings to establish the 'Romescot,' or Peter's Pence; and thinks that the 'Rome-feoh,' as a national tax, was not imposed before the days of King Alfred. It is first mentioned by name in the reign of Alfred's son Edward (*Anglo-Sax. Church*, i. 257 *seq.*). "Ad quam (scholam) reges Angliæ . . . . cum clericis in doctrina et fide catholica erudiendi venirent, ne quid in Ecclesia Anglicana sinistrum, aut veritati Catholicæ contrarium doceretur" (*Mat. Par.*, ed. Rolls, i. 330).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nothing intrinsically improbable; nay, considering we find a *schola* (colony) of the English certainly established in Rome in the days of Leo III. (†816)—(*cf. L. P.* in vit. Leo III., § 372)—it should be even called probably true. But the distance of time that separates Ina and the monk makes the statements of the latter about the early history of our country proportionately open to suspicion.

Theodo, Duke of Bavaria, in Rome, 716.

King Ina was not the only royal personage whom authentic documents enable us to see in Rome in the days of Pope Gregory. Before the end of the sixth century there seem to have been Christian dukes in Bavaria, but it was only during the seventh century apparently that Christianity was to any considerable extent propagated among the Bavarians. Its true apostle, St. Emmeran, had been slain in the middle of that century; and in the beginning of the eighth century its Duke Theodo, called II. by some and I. by others, came to Rome, 'the first of his race,' to pray (*orationis voto*).[1] He doubtless also came to arrange with Gregory about taking further measures for the complete conversion of his country. For in the May of this same year (716) Gregory addressed a series of instructions to Bishop Martinian, and to Gregory and Dorotheus, deacon and subdeacon of the Apostolic See, when setting out for Bavaria. He bade them, in conjunction with the duke, establish ecclesiastical discipline; and, after careful instruction of the candidates, to constitute a hierarchy. If, however, they cannot find a proper person to set over the new episcopate as archbishop, they are to send word to him (Gregory), and he will send a suitable one.[2] He gave minute directions as to what they were

[1] *L. P.*; Paulus Diac., *De Gest. Langob.*, vi. 44.

[2] Ap. Mansi, xii. 257; Fleury, ix. 157. "Si certe talem non invenire poteritis, hoc aut per vos, aut per vestras litteras innotescatis; quatenus de hac sacra sede prævidentes, utilem cum Dei auxilio dirigamus."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to teach concerning marriage, a matter undoubtedly of as much importance in civilising and christianising a wild and pagan people as in preserving a civilisation already acquired. The man who tampers with the sacred truths in connection with marriage is aiming destructive blows at the very key-stone of civilisation. As very important points to be attended to in the conversion of idolaters, the Pope exhorted the missionaries to warn the people against the observance of dreams, and of lucky and unlucky days, and against incantations and witchcraft. The necessity of personal penance for sin, the resurrection of the body and the eternity of hell, were also among the striking truths that the Pope would have impressed on the minds of the heathen Bavarians.

To revert for a moment to Theodo, the convert of St. Rupert (†718). He seems to have died (716 or 717) soon after his visit to Rome, before the death of his spiritual father, and before the return to Bavaria of the saint now to be spoken of.

St. Corbinian.

To help to hasten on the conversion of Bavaria, Gregory induced St. Corbinian, a Frank, like most of the other missionaries who converted the Bavarians, whom his predecessor had ordained bishop, not to retire from the world, as the worthy bishop wished to do, but to return and continue his labours in the Lord's vineyard. The chronology of the life of St. Corbinian is a little obscure, owing to a mistake (in c. 2) of his biographer Aribo,[1] his third successor (764–784) in the See of Freisingen, who has either confused Pepin 'of Heristal' with Charles Martel or Constantine with Gregory II.

If, however, with the Bollandists we suppose that Aribo, who as a boy may have seen Corbinian, by an easy lapse of memory assigned the two visits of the saint to Rome

[1] Ap. *Acta SS.*, Sept. 8.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to the reign of the same Pope (Gregory II.), the narrative of Aribo will be consistent, not only with itself but with other historical data. Though a man of strong feeling, not to say temper—indeed, no doubt on that very account —it is plain that Corbinian exerted a great influence on all with whom he came into contact. Wherever he went he soon became very popular, and was everywhere sought after. Fearing that his popularity would prove a snare to his virtue, he left his native place (near Melun, not far from Paris), and went to Rome with a number of disciples, not only to seek the Pope's instruction and prayers,[1] but also that he might obtain a quiet spot, where, away from the praise and flattery of men, he could live under monastic rule. This was probably in 709, when Constantine was Pope. But it was not difficult to conclude that a man with such spirit as Corbinian, and with such a winning personality, was a proper subject for the performance of great things. Constantine would not allow him to hide his light under a bushel. He consecrated him bishop, and gave him the pallium, which, though usually the sign of archiepiscopal jurisdiction, was, as we have seen, occasionally bestowed on bishops. To Frankland accordingly Corbinian returned, to work with the power of a successor of the apostles. Again was the homage of men at his feet, and again did he seek to shun its dangerous allurements by retiring to a cell. His retreat was discovered, and once more did men flock around him; and once more had he recourse to Rome, hoping that what one Pope had refused another might grant. No doubt to avoid embarrassing recognition, he did not go through Gaul but through Germany. Whilst he was journeying through Bavaria (717), it in some way came to the ears of Theodo, who had by that

[1] "Et ibi (at Rome) se Apostolici (the Pope) doctrinæ et orationibus commendare," c. 2.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

time returned from Rome, that the saintly Corbinian was on his way to the Eternal City. He invited him to come to him.[1] Especially eager was the duke's son, Grimwald, that he should abide with them. But to escape from the turmoil of the world was the deep desire of Corbinian. He continued his journey to Rome 'to obtain his release'—*solutionem percipere.*

Gregory II., however, proved no more amenable than his predecessor. Still, with a view of making a deeper impression on the saint, he examined the affair in a synod. All were of opinion that he should return to the Lord's vineyard. Not to be disobedient, Corbinian submitted, and again turned his face towards the North. He was not destined to reach the land of the Franks. Grimwald had resolved that if the saint had to return to the world, he should remain to labour in Bavaria. This, perforce, Corbinian had to do. Grimwald, however, had soon reason to regret his pious violence. He had married his brother's widow, the beautiful Piltrudis. Corbinian, who had now fixed his See at Freisingen in Upper Bavaria, denounced the marriage; and after a long struggle succeeded in bringing about a separation between the pair. But Piltrudis returned to Grimwald and to influence. Corbinian was banished. The misdeeds of the guilty couple were destined to be punished even in this life. To ensure a more real dependence of the Bavarians on the Frankish kingdom, Charles Martel invaded Bavaria both in 725 and 729. Grimwald lost his life (725 or 729) and Piltrudis her liberty. She was carried into Frankland by Charles, and seems to have died in poverty. The Bavarian dukedom passed to Hucbert, Grimwald's nephew. He recalled Corbinian, who died work-

[1] "Qui dum virum Dei Corbinianum ibidem advenisse cognovit ad se invitavit," c. 3.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ing for the conversion of the Bavarians,[1] probably in 730.

St. Boniface (Winfrid).

But the one who firmly established the faith in Bavaria, as in the whole of Germany, was St. Boniface, or Winfrid, which was his proper name. This glorious apostle of Germany was one of our own countrymen, having been born at Crediton, in Devonshire,[2] about 680. This is not the place to treat at length of the heroic labours of St. Boniface for the conversion[3] of the Germans. We must be content to unfold his relations with the popes.

First journey to Rome.

Fired with zeal for the conversion of nations, Winfrid, who had become a monk, betook himself to Rome (718); and, as the abbess of Minster expressed[4] it to Boniface himself, God "moved the pontiff of the glorious See to grant the desire of your heart." With all the ardour of his soul, Winfrid poured forth to the Pope the cause of his coming to him, and told him[5] with what a longing desire he had wished to preach the Gospel to the

[1] *Cf. Hist. de l'église de France*, by Jager, iii. pp. 459-464; De Sauclières, *Hist. des Conc.*, iii. p. 164; Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, Sept. 8; especially *Acta SS., Sept. III.*

[2] The life of St. Boniface was written by the priest Willibald—not a bishop nor a disciple of St. Boniface, as Jaffé shows—in 768, thirteen years after the death of the saint. This life has been published by various editors, *e.g.*, Serarius, in 1605, at the end of his edition of the saint's letters; by Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist. SS.*, ii.; and by Jaffé (Berlin, 1866). *Cf.* also the life by the monk Otholo, who wrote in the second half of the eleventh century. In 735 Boniface called himself 'decrepit,' Ep. 34.

[3] *Cf.* Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, June 5; Lingard's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, ii. c. 14; Mrs. Hope's *Conversion of the Teutonic Race*, vol. ii.: '*Germans.*'

[4] Ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. p. 264.

[5] The details of this interview we have from Willibald, c. 5, p. 26 of Jaffé's edition: "Omnemque sibi (Gregorio) per ordinem itineris sui atque adventus occasionem manifestavit, et, quali anxius desiderio diutius desudasset, aperuit. Sanctus itaque papa, repente hilari vultu adridentbusque oculis intuitus in eum, inquisivit, an litteras ab episcopo suo commendaticias detulisset," etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

heathens. Delighted with the saint's vivacity, the Pope could not forbear to smile at the earnestness of the young Englishman at his feet; but to be sure that the zeal came from true virtue, and was according to order, Gregory asked the youth if he had commendatory letters from his bishop. At the word the letters were at once produced. From them, the idea which Gregory had conceived of Boniface was confirmed, and daily conferences were held between them. At length (May 15, 719), with the Pope's blessing and with letters from him, Boniface was "sent to the wild nations of Germany to see whether the rude soil of their hearts, when tilled by the ploughshare of the Gospel, would receive the seed of truth."[1] In the letter of authorisation to preach in Germany, which Gregory addressed[2] to Boniface, the Pope approves of his desire, as well on account of his earnest zeal and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures as because he had proceeded in the proper order, viz., as a member of a body, and had put himself in communication with the head. "And so," continues[3] the Pope, "in the name of the undivided Trinity, and by the irrefragable authority of Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, whose place we hold, go forth and preach to the nations in the bonds of error the truths of both testaments."

The Christianity that Boniface found in Germany.

Before the coming of St. Boniface, Christianity, as we have seen, had been preached in Germany, but in a

[1] Willibald, c. 5, p. 26 of Jaffé's edition.

[2] Ap. Mansi, xii., and Ep. 118, ap. Epp. Bonif., ed. Serarius; Ep. 12, *M. G. H.* This letter is addressed to 'Boniface,' the priest, and is dated the Ides of May, 2nd Indiction (viz., May 15, 719). Note that Winfrid had already assumed the Latin name of Boniface.

[3] "Ideo in nomine indivisibilis Trinitatis, per inconcussam auctoritatem B. Petri App. principis, cujus doctrinæ magisteriis dispensatione fungimur . . . . præcipimus . . . . ad gentes quascunque infidelitatis errore detentas properare . . . . potueris, ... et per spiritum virtutis . . . . prædicationem utriusque testamenti mentibus indoctis consona ratione transfundas." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

more or less desultory kind of way. Owing, however, to the isolation and smallness of the Christian communities, little advancement was being made. In fact, in many instances, they were themselves eaten up with errors and superstitions. After having purified its various parts, Boniface put the Church in Germany on a firm basis, by welding the different communities together and joining them with the centre of Christian life, the See of Rome. Justly did he earn for himself the admiration of the Christian Europe of his day, the everlasting gratitude of the German people from that time forth, the title of Apostle of Germany, and the martyr's crown!

Boniface, following out the papal instructions,[1] began his labours in Thuringia. There, and in Hesse and Saxony, he laboured unremittingly in restoring discipline and in purifying and spreading the faith. After many thousand pagans had embraced[2] the doctrines of Christ, Boniface sent (722) one Bynnan to Rome to tell the Pope what had been done, and to ask a variety of questions as to the direction of the infant Church. The Pope replied by summoning Boniface to Rome. In company with a number of his brethren, Boniface at once set out for Rome in the autumn of 722. From Willibald we learn that the sight of the Eternal City deeply moved him, as it must move every true Christian. "As soon[3] as he caught sight of the walls of Rome, he poured forth praise to God; and when he reached St. Peter's he armed himself with prayer." The Pope met

[1] "In Thyringeam, juxta mandatum apostolicæ sedis .... progressus est." Vita Willib., c. 5.

[2] "Multisque milibus hominum .... baptizatis, idoneum nuntium .... nomine Bynnan Romam direxit." *Ib.*, c. 6.

[3] "Et Romanæ urbis mœnibus conspectis, Altithrono repente condignas gratiarum laudes rependit, et ad B. Petri mox æcclesiam perveniens, diligenti se oratione munivit." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the saint in St. Peter's; and, after mutual greetings, at once proceeded to question him with regard to the faith he had been teaching. Perhaps some wicked persons, from jealousy or other motives, had been casting aspersions on the doctrinal preaching of Boniface. "Apostolic father,"[1] answered Boniface, "as a foreigner I find it hard to understand your speech; give me but time, and I will set forth my faith in writing." Readily, of course, was the delay granted. It is interesting to observe from this passage that the pure Latinity affected by St. Gregory the Great had in a hundred years so changed in the mouth of his illustrious namesake, that to a stranger it was not easy to follow its altered form! Some days after his profession of faith had been handed in to the Pope, Boniface, called to the Lateran, received it back from Gregory, with an exhortation ever to stand by it himself, and with all his strength to preach it to others. Then on November 30, 722, Gregory consecrated Boniface bishop.[2] In accordance with the general custom of the bishops ordained at Rome, Boniface, with his own hand, wrote out a profession of faith, which he swore to follow, and placed it on the tomb of St. Peter. The oath which Boniface took was much the same as that taken by the bishops of Italy, and had been in use as far back as the pontificate of Gelasius I.[3] (492–496). It is given[4]

[1] "Domine apostolice, novi me imperitum, jam peregrinus, vestræ familiaritatis sermone; sed queso, ut otium mihi tempus conscribendæ fidei concedas, et muta tantum littera meam fidem adaperiat." Vita Willib., c. 6.

[2] *Ib.* The true date may be 723.

[3] See the *Liber diurnus Rom. Pont.*, F. 75, ed. Sickel. Reprinted in the *M. G. H. Epp.*, iii. 265. In the oath, as taken by Boniface, there is no mention of loyalty to the empire.

[4] See it also quoted in Lingard, *A.-Sax. Church*, Note T, vol. ii.; Alzog, *Universal Church Hist.*, ii. p. 84, etc. *Cf.* also *St. Boniface and the Conversion of Germany* by Mrs. Hope, p. 79.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

towards the beginning of Otholo's life of our saint, and runs as follows: "In the name of Our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the sixth year after the consulship of the emperor Leo, and in the fourth year of the emperor Constantine his son, in the sixth Indiction:—

"I, Boniface, by the grace of God, bishop, promise to thee, Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to thy Vicar, the Blessed Pope Gregory and his successors, by the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, undivided Trinity, and by thy most holy body, to proclaim the whole Catholic faith in all its purity; and by the help of God, to remain steadfast in the unity of that faith, in which, without doubt, is the Christian's hope of salvation. Never, at the bidding of anyone, will I do anything against the unity of the One Universal Church; but, as I have said, I will in all things be faithful and helpful to thee and to the interests of thy Church (to which God has given the power of binding and loosing), and thy said Vicar and his successors.

"Moreover, I will hold no communion with any bishops who may contemn the canons, but, if I can, will prevent them from so doing; and, if I cannot, will denounce them to the Holy See.

"And if, which God forbid, I should at any time or in any way act against this oath of mine, may I be found guilty at the last judgment and incur the penalty of Ananias and Saphira, who dared to speak a lie to you.

"This oath, I, Boniface, a lowly bishop, have written out with my own hand; and, according to what is prescribed, have placed it on the most holy body of Blessed Peter, and, in the sight of God, have sworn to keep it."

Gregory did not detain Boniface in Rome long after his consecration (November 30, 722), but sent him back

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

again to the field of his toils with a book of the canons,[1] a letter of recommendation to Charles Martel; a synodal[2] letter—so called because read at the synod held for the installation of the new bishop—addressed to the clergy and people; a letter[3] to all the clergy, the 'glorious Dukes,' the "magnificent Castellans, Counts, and to all God-fearing Christians"; and two others to the Thuringians and to the Alt or Old Saxons in particular.

The powerful Mayor of the palace received our saint with the greatest reverence (723); took him under his protection; and in a letter,[4] in which he styles himself 'illustrious' and 'Majordomo,' and which he addressed to his "Lords and Fathers in Christ the Bishops, to Dukes, Counts, Vicars, Domestics, Stewards, to his Juniors, to the (royal) *Missi* and to his friends," Charles informs them all that Boniface has been placed under his 'Mundbyrd,'[5] that is, under his special protection. With the strength of Charles Martel to help him, Boniface resumed his labours in Hesse and Thuringia; and, as it were by magic,

[1] "Eique libellum, in quo sacratissima ecclesiasticæ constitutionis jura pontificalibus sunt digesta conventibus, accommodavit." Willib., c. 6; Ep. to Charles, *M. G. H.*, 20.

[2] Ap. Mansi, xii.; *M. G. H.*, 18. It is practically the same as the 'synodal' in use in the time of Pope Gelasius, as may be seen by comparing it with the 'synodal' in the *Liber Diurnus*.

[3] Ap. Mansi, xii.; *M. G. H.*, 17. "Greg. Ep. Servus servorum Dei, universis reverendissimis sacratissimis fratribus coepiscopis, ... gloriosis Ducibus, magnificis Castaldiis, Comitibus," etc. These letters are dated Dec. 1, 722 (or 723?). To all the Thuringians, *S.* 119, *M. G. H.*, 19; to the Saxons, *S.* 121, *M. G. H.*, 21.

[4] Ep. 32 *S.*, ed. *M. G. H.*, 22.

[5] "Fecimus ei (Bonifacio) manum nostram roboratam dare, ut ubicumque, ubi et ubi ambulare videtur, cum nostro amore, vel sub nostro mundeburdio et defensione quietus vel conservatus esse debeat." Ep. Caroli; or ep. 22, *M. G. H.* 'Mundeburdio' or 'mundeburgio' is a German word, from an obsolete 'munder,' meaning a memoir, and bürge, bail or security. See a formula of a 'charter of Munderburde,' ap. Marculf, *Formulæ*, i. 24, ed. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 87, p. 714.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

churches, monasteries and episcopal Sees sprang up in all directions.[1]

Informed by the letters of Boniface of what was being effected in Germany in the way of conversion by his exertions, Gregory wrote[2] to congratulate him on his success (December 4, 724); but, to keep him humble, did not fail to remind him that it was God who gives the increase, and that he must persevere in the good he was doing if he hoped to gain the immortal crown of victory. But Gregory did not content himself with a mere verbal interest in the work of Boniface. He showed his practical concern in the endeavours of our saint, not merely by writing[3] to the Thuringians to urge them to renounce their idolatry and to receive Boniface, whom "we have sent to you to baptize you . . . . not for any temporal gain, but for the good of your souls"; but also by trying to procure the active interference of Charles Martel in his favour. A certain bishop, anxious to reap where he had not sown, claimed part of the newly-converted province as belonging to his diocese. Concerning this bishop, writes[4] Gregory to Boniface, "we have written paternal letters to our most excellent son and patrician Charles, begging him to restrain the said bishop, and we have little doubt that the matter will be attended to."

The last communication that the Pope had with Boniface was towards the close of 726. Boniface had sent

[1] "Cui (Bonifacio) Deus tantam in omni Germania potestatem contulit, ut, quovis vellet, ecclesias cœnobiaque fundaret, sedes episcopales statueret parrochiasque earum divideret." Otholo, vit. in præfat.

[2] Ep. 125, ed. *S.*; 24, *M. G. H.*

[3] Ep. 120, ed. *S.*; *M. G. H. Epp.*, 25. "Bonifacium ad vos direximus, ut vos debeat baptizare . . . . non pro lucro aliquo temporali conquirendo, sed pro lucro animarum vestrarum." This letter also belongs to the year 724.

[4] Ep. 24, *M. G. H.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to ask the Pope for solutions to various difficulties that had cropped up in the course of his administering the young Church, just as St. Augustine consulted St. Gregory I. To these questions Gregory returned[1] (November 22, 726) suitable answers, "not from us as of ourselves, but by the grace of Him who opens the mouth of the dumb and makes 'the tongues of infants eloquent'" (Wisd. x. 21). Some of the questions related to marriage, others to the question of re-baptism, and others to contagious diseases. The replies of the Pope (*ex apostolicæ sedis vigore*) were in accordance with canon law or sound practical sense, as the case might be. His letter concludes with the prayer that "He who, by apostolic authority, has caused you to go into those countries in our stead, may help you to obtain the reward of your labours and us to get the pardon of our sins." The rest of the career of St. Boniface, his reception of the pallium, his third journey to Rome, his reforms in Gaul, and his martyrdom (June 5, 755), belong to the times of St. Gregory III., Zachary and Stephen III., and will be treated of in the lives of those popes.

Minor events.

Before proceeding with the most important events of Gregory's reign, viz., his relations with the Lombards and the Iconoclast emperors, relations, it may be observed, very much interconnected, the remaining minor events of his pontificate may be conveniently noticed here.

From the lists of church repairs and decorations ordered by Gregory, left us by his biographer, we may safely conclude he was a lover of the glory of God's House. A still extant inscription between the doors which lead

[1] Ep. 26, ed. *M. G. H.* "Consulenti tibi de statu Ecclesiæ non ex nobis, quasi ex nobis, sed ejus gratia, qui aperit os mutum et 'linguas infantium facit disertas,' qualiter tenere debeas, Apostolici vigoris doctrina edicimus."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from the vestibule into the interior of St. Peter's records the donation by Gregory of certain lands and olive groves to SS. Peter and Paul, to provide the lamps of the basilica with oil—*pro concinnatione luminariorum vestrorum*, as it was expressed. He founded monasteries round the great basilica of St. Paul, outside the walls, that there might be monks to recite therein the Divine Office by day and by night. His action with regard to his ancestral mansion, and his founding or restoring various other monasteries,[1] show him also as a lover of the monastic order. Among the monasteries restored by Gregory II. was the famous monastery on Monte Cassino, one of the highest hills in its neighbourhood, and which overlooks the city of San Germano. About the year 580 the original abbey had been destroyed by the Lombards. The monks had fled to Rome, where, under Pope Pelagius II., they had founded the Lateran monastery. Sometime about the year 717, as is generally supposed, a citizen of Brescia, one Petronax, "full of the fire of divine love,"[2] came to Rome; and, at the exhortation of Pope Gregory, betook himself to Monte Cassino, and became the second founder of the glorious abbey of that name. He was helped in his work as well by some hermits, whom he found on the mountain, as by some monks of the Lateran congregation, assigned to him by the Pope. With Petronax, therefore, Gregory shares the honour of being the second of the four founders of the world-renowned monastery of Monte Cassino.

Restores 'Monte Cassino,' 717–718.

Among the great monasteries of Italy which were rebuilt or founded during the eighth century was the famous one of St. Vincent's on the river Volturno. It was founded by three young noblemen of Benevento during the reign of Gregory, and was first governed

St. Vincent's on the Volturno.

[1] *Cf. L. P.*

[2] Paul. Diac., vi. 40; Leo Ost., *Chron.*, i. 4.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by its three founders in succession. On the death of the first abbot (720), the second of the three noblemen, Taso by name, a cousin of the first, was chosen abbot. The choice was in some respects unfortunate, as the zeal and sanctity of Taso were wanting in discretion, probably on account of his youth, as he was the youngest of the three. He would have placed upon the monks burdens greater than they could bear. The consequence was that Taso was deposed, and his elder brother Tato was elected abbot in his stead. An appeal to Rome was the consequence. Gregory, of course, condemned the conduct of the rebellious monks, and inflicted a severe penance upon them—apparently some hard manual labour. For we are told that the heat rendered the penance very difficult of accomplishment. Autpert (†*c.* 778), a monk, and afterwards abbot of this same monastery, who tells us[1] this incident, adds that God also punished the disobedient monks. They soon all died, and were shortly afterwards followed to the grave by the abbot himself. Autpert tells us that he wrote down this sequel to the affair, that "for the future both shepherd and flock might refrain from such disturbing conduct."

The Pope and the Saracens.

A very curious story is to be found in the *Liber Pontificalis* in connection with the Saracens in Spain, which serves at least to show that Gregory was watching with an anxious eye over the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare of his flock, and that consequently he was doing all he could to encourage the leaders of the Franks in their efforts against the Moslems, who for the second time had just besieged Constantinople itself. In the year 711 the Mohammedans poured into Spain, and in ten years not only overthrew the Visigothic kingdom in what is now called Spain, but were contesting (721) that

[1] *Vita Paldonis, Tasonis*, etc., c. 12, 13, ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

part of it which had once extended over southern France. Unfortunately, whether in ancient or modern authors,[1] it is not easy to determine the exact order of events in this invasion of the Moslems. However, it seems clear that beneath the walls of Toulouse, Eudo, Duke of Aquitaine, gained a victory over them (721)[2] by his own unaided efforts, eleven years before Charles Martel, with the aid of Eudo, for ever did away with danger from them to France in the decisive battle of Poitiers (732). According to the *Book of the Popes*, Gregory had sent 'three blessed sponges'[3] to the Frankish leader in the preceding year (720). Of these Eudo gave small particles to his troops to be eaten just before the battle. We are assured that of those who eat of the blessed sponge, not one was slain or wounded! The use of 'sponges' in this connection seems so extraordinary, that it has been contended, *e.g.*, by Jager,[4] that the Pope sent indeed some *eulogiæ*, *i.e.*, blessed

[1] *Cf.* Paul. Diac., *H. L.*, vi. 46; *L. P.*, and the French and Spanish authorities cited by Dunford in his *Hist. of Spain*, i. p. 229; Fleury, ix. 225; *Hist. of France*, by Kitchin, i. 105. According to the *Annales Veteres Franc.* (Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98), ad an. 715, it was in 720 that the Saracens began to besiege Toulouse: "Post IX anno quam in Spania ingressi sunt Saraceni."

[2] "Ejecit Heudo Saracenos de Aquitania" is the entry for the year 721 in the "Ann. Lauresh., Almanici, and Nazariani," ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i.

[3] Comparing different versions of the *Liber Pont.*, and the facts therein contained, it would seem that the victory here spoken of by *Anastasius*, and by him referred to the reign of this Pope, really refers, in part at least, to the victory of Charles Martel at Poitiers, and should be assigned to the reign of Gregory III. (732); he has, therefore, to say the least, confused the two battles; and so what he quotes from a letter of Eudo to the Pope (viz., the number of Saracens slain, 375,000) should be referred to Gregory III.'s reign.

[4] *Hist. de l'église de France*, iii. 489, 60. One of the versions of the passage in the *L. P.* reads: "Facta est autem Francorum generalis motio contra eos (Saracenos), et . . . . interemerunt uno die ex eis ccclxxv millia; ex Francorum vero parte mille tantum quingenti interierunt, ut Francorum missa Pontifici epistola con-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

bread or some other blessed present; but that for 'sponges' (*spongiæ*) should be read *sportulæ* or baskets. So that the passage would indicate that "three baskets of blessed bread, such as used at the Pope's table," were sent to Eudo. Such an alteration of the text, however, is at once arbitrary and unnecessary. In days when people eat their food with their fingers, sponges would be a useful adjunct to the dinner table. And, likely enough, they were not so common among the Franks in the eighth century that they might not well serve as fitting objects for a Pope to send as a present—the more so that, then as now, Catholics value a present from the Pope because it has come from his anointed hands, and not so much because of its intrinsic worth. Gregory no doubt sent the three sponges for lavatory purposes! The use they were actually put to by Eudo was due to the lively faith of that warrior. The passage is chiefly important, however, as we have said already, inasmuch as it shows that Gregory was carefully watching the movements of the Saracens, and was kept informed as to what was being done against them.

Synod in Rome, April 5, 721.

But political affairs, great and important though they were, did not take up the whole of Gregory's attention. In the April of 721 a synod at Rome under his guidance drew up[1] seventeen canons for the furtherance of discipline. These canons had reference mostly to the Sacrament of matrimony, and forbade marriage with those consecrated to God, or between near relatives.

Gregory's next occupation was that of peacemaker.

Gregory makes peace between the patriarchs of Grado and Aquileia, 723.

The 'schism of Aquileia' was at least fruitful in one respect. It engendered *two* patriarchs.[2] As might be

tinebat. Qui Pontifex anno præmisso in benedictionem eis direxerat tres spongias," etc.

[1] Mansi, xii.; Héfélé, *Hist. of the Councils*, v. p. 256, Eng. trans.

[2] *Cf. supra*, 95, 166 f., and Pt. I., 317.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

expected, two men with very large powers, but with a limited area to exercise them in, did not always agree as to how much of the said area was the peculiar sphere of action of each of them. The patriarch of Aquileia, at this time, was Serenus, Bishop of Forum Julii (Cividale), whose rights were limited to the mainland of Venetia, to that part where reached the power of the Lombards. In virtue of a request preferred by Liutprand, Gregory sent the *pallium*[1] to Serenus. Elated at this, Serenus began to encroach on the rights of Grado. Donatus, the patriarch of Grado, appealed to Gregory for protection. Gregory at once wrote[2] to Serenus (December 1, 723), reminding him that humility was the noblest ornament of high station, and that he (the Pope) had sent him the pallium on the understanding that he would not attempt to interfere with what was due to others. By virtue of his apostolical authority he warned the patriarch not to transgress the rights of others, but to be content with his own, otherwise he would feel the weight of apostolical rigour.

On the other hand, Gregory wrote[3] to Donatus, the patriarch of Grado, *i.e.*, the patriarch of Aquileia resident in Grado, to his suffragans, to Marcellus the Doge, and to the people of Venetia and Istria. To judge from the Pope's letter, Donatus had objected to the Pope's granting the pallium to Serenus at all. For the Pope opens his letter by reminding Donatus,[4] that in virtue of the office, which

[1] *Cf.* Dandolo in *Chron.*, ap. Muratori, *R. I. S.*, xii. p. 132; and John the Deacon, *Chronicon Gradense*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. SS.*, vii. 46; or *M. G. SS. Langob.*, c. 8, 9.

[2] "Ex auctoritate apostolica præcipimus, ne ullo modo terminos ab eo possessos accedas, sed de his habeto quæ modo usque possedisti; nec amplius quam in finibus gentis Longobardorum existentibus gressum tendere præsumas." Ep. 15, Greg.; or *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 395.

[3] *Ib.* Ep. 16, Greg.

[4] Ep. 16. "Ex ministerio, quod ex miseratione divina gerimus, quicquid provide deliberatum peragere, *absque obstaculo*, convenit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by the divine mercy he holds, it is his to carry through—all obstacles to the contrary notwithstanding—whatever he has, after careful consideration, judged to be right. However, continues Gregory, he has no wish to act in that high-handed manner; and he informs Donatus of the line of conduct he has adopted towards Serenus. In conclusion he warns them all to look to it, that the Lombards do not take advantage of any dissension among them to make an attempt upon their country. The patriotism of the man is apparent everywhere!

The Bishop of Pola usurps the See of Grado, 725.

On the death of Donatus, Peter, Bishop of Pola, was translated to, or usurped, the See of Grado. Translation from see to see, however, was not of old in accordance with the discipline of the Church; and Pope Gregory at once declared Peter deprived of both Pola and Grado. The people of Venetia, at whose invitation, doubtless, Peter had left his See of Pola, begged the Pope to have mercy. Gregory, therefore, allowed Peter to return to his original See; but by letter warned the people of Venetia only to elect their bishops in accordance with the laws of God and the Church.[1] At the bidding of this same Gregory II., not of Gregory III., as the date of this letter proves, Antoninus[2] was elected patriarch of Grado. Space enough has now been given to what may be regarded as the minor events of Gregory's reign. Our attention must now be given to the Pope's dealings with the Lombards and the Iconoclast Emperor Leo, the Isaurian—dealings which occupied almost the whole reign of Gregory.

[1] *Cf.* Dandolo in *Chron.* The letter (dated March 1, 725) is given in *M. G. Epp.*, iii., along with the two preceding ones.

[2] *Cf. Chron. Pat. Grad.* "Qui (Greg. III., says the Chronicle, but it should be Greg. II.) post obitum Donati Gradensis patriarche epistolam suam direxit universis Venetiensis seu Histrie et cuncto populo, ut electionem in Gradensem patriarcham facerent; qui precepto ejusdem p. Gregorii elegerunt Antoninum."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

There seems to have been a fairly good understanding between the Lombards and Gregory in the early days of his pontificate. As Dr. Hodgkin takes notice,[1] Liutprand was swayed in the drawing up of his laws by the letters of the Pope, "who is the head of the Churches of God, and of the priests in the whole world." And at the exhortation of Gregory he abandoned his designs on the patrimony of the 'Cottian Alps,' and confirmed the restitution of it which had been made by Aripert II.[2] When trouble with the Lombards did begin, it was not with their king, but with one of the practically independent Lombard dukes, Romwald II. It was to render these dukes more submissive that, as will be noted presently, there took place such an extraordinary alliance as that between an exarch and a king of the Lombards!

Liutprand confirms the restoration of the Cottian Alps, 716.

By stratagem, and at a time when there was[3] peace between the Lombards and the empire, the Lombards of the Duchy of Benevento got possession (717) of Cumæ, a town that belonged to the Duchy of Naples. In Rome all was sadness at this untoward event, as their communications with Naples were now cut off. But the loyalty and patriotism of Gregory were equal to the occasion. Though, ever since the recall of Narses, the 'Roman' emperors at Constantinople were only theoretically the rulers of any part of Italy at any distance from the walls of Ravenna, still, despite the outrageous treatment the popes received at their worthless hands, they (the popes) remained faith-

The Lombards seize Cumæ, 717.

[1] *Italy*, vi. pp. 394–440. "Papa urbis Romæ, qui in omni mundo toto caput ecclesiarum Dei et sacerdotum est." Liut., *Legum*, l. v. c. 4, ap. *R. I. S.*, i. p. ii.

[2] *Cf.* Bede, *De sex ætat.*, ad ann. 708 and 719; *L. P.* in vit. Joan. VII. and Greg. II. Paul. Diac., *De Gest. L.*, vi. 28 and vi. 43, where he says: "Eo tempore Luitprandus Rex, donationem Patrimonii Alpium Cottiarum Romanæ Ecclesiæ confirmavit." *Cf. sup.*, p. 111 *f.*

[3] "Cumanum castrum ipso fuerat tempore a Longobardis pacis dolo pervasum." *L. P. Cf. Gesta Epp. Neap.*, c. 36.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ful to the emperors as long as it was at all possible. And so, on the present occasion, filled with grief at what had happened, Gregory used every means to induce the Lombards to give up their ill-gotten gains. He threatened them with the divine vengeance for their perfidy; he offered them money. But the Lombards despised the Pope's threats and his money alike. Failing in this direction, Gregory, by daily letters, did his best to rouse the Duke of Naples into action, telling him what ought[1] to be done, and promising to reward him if he were successful. With Theodimus, a subdeacon, one of the 'rectors' of the patrimony[2] at his back, the Duke John managed in his turn to take Cumæ by surprise, killed or captured the Lombard garrison, and for further reward received from the truly patriotic Pope no less an amount than 70[3] lbs. of gold, or about £3000, a very considerable sum in those days. The apparently conflicting action of the Lombards at this period may be best harmonised by reflecting that ambitious and able sovereigns seem to have the power of summoning similar spirits around them; that it was Liutprand's aim to make all Italy, in fact as well as in name, dependent on him; and that consequently

[1] "Ducatum eis qualiter agerent quotidie scribendo præsentabat." *L. P. Cf.* on this episode, John the Deacon, *Vit. Epp. Neap.* in vit. Sergii.

[2] In the Church of St. Andrew *ad Nidum* (now St. Marco dei tavernari in the via della Salvatore), in Naples, there was still to be read in the seventeenth century the epitaph of Theodimus. It was recorded among other things: "Hic in pace membra sunt posita Theodimi subd(iaconi) reg(ionarii) et rect(oris) sancte sed(is) apost(olice) et disp(ensatoris) hujus diac(oniæ) beati Andreæ." It is thought that this deaconry (wrongly printed *ad Nilum* in Duchesne), was the abode of the rector of the Roman Church who administered the Neapolitan patrimony—*corpus patrimonii Campaniæ Neapolitani*, Jaffé, 2218 (1706), etc., from the register of Gregory II. *Cf. Topografia della città di Napoli nell' xi secolo* by B. Capasso.

[3] *L. P.*, § 181.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he was not displeased when he beheld his more or less independent dukes and the exarch busily engaged in destroying one another's power.

Capture and restoration of Classis, about 717.

The next move on the part of the Lombards was the capture of Classis,[1] the seaport of Ravenna, by Farwald II., Duke of Spoleto, again in time of peace! By the order of Liutprand it was restored to the exarch. Nothing could give a better proof of the weakness of the imperial power in Italy at this period than this seizing of Classis by a Lombard duke, and its restitution at the bidding of a Lombard king. As in the days of Agilulf, Italy would have fallen altogether into the hands of the Lombards had it not been for Pope Gregory I.; so would it now in the days of Liutprand, had it not been for the watchfulness, personal influence, and liberally spent money of the second Gregory.

Gregory seeks for help from Charles Martel 721 (?).

The Pope well understood the signs of the times. In the interval of seeming rest that followed the raids on Classis and Cumæ, when men said there was peace, Gregory knew there was no peace. He did his best to meet the storm he saw was brewing. He turned for help, where Pelagius II. had long before declared[2] that divine providence had ordained help to come from, viz., from the Franks. Gregory wrote for aid to Charles Martel.[3]

[1] Paul., *H. L.*, vi. 44. *Cf. L. P.*, n. 13; and Agnellus of Ravenna, c. 151, under the life of John VII., who became archbishop, *c.* 725.

[2] Writing (Oct. 5, 580) to Aunachar, Bishop of Auxerre, Pelagius says: "Nec enim credimus, sine magna divinæ providentiæ admiratione dispositum, quod vestri reges Romano imperio in orthodoxæ fidei confessione sunt similes; nisi ut huic urbi, ex qua fuerat oriunda, vel universæ Italiæ finitimos adjutoresque præstaret." Ap. Mansi, ix. *Cf. Hist. de l'égl. de France*, by Jager, vol. ii., ad an. 580.

[3] *Cf. L. P.* in vit. Step. III. Seeing that no help from the Imperial power was to be looked for, Stephen wrote to Pepin: "quemadmodum prædecessores ejus beatæ memoriæ D. Gregorius, et Gregorius alius, et D. Zacharias . . . . Carolo Regi Francorum direxerunt, petentes sibi subveniri propter oppressiones" (Longobardorum).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But either Charles had too much to do himself, in the way of driving back the Saracens, or else he had some understanding with his warlike brother-in-law. At any rate, no help was sent by him. And help was certainly needed if the power of the Lombards was to be checked.

The Lombards seize Narni, 724.

Somewhere about the year 725, the 'Lombards,' whether Transamund, Duke of Spoleto, or Liutprand himself, is not clear, but probably the former, took[1] the important mountain fortified city of Narni, on the Flaminian Way, and on the frontier of the Roman Duchy. To add fuel to the flames, there appeared in 726 Leo III.'s decree against images.

Leo III., the Isaurian, 716–741.

Two military revolutions, which brought to an abrupt close the short reigns of Anastasius II. and Theodosius III.,[2] raised to the imperial throne the rude warrior, generally known as Leo (III.) the Isaurian, or as Leo the Iconoclast. By the force of a strong or unscrupulous character he had worked himself up from the ranks of the people to the position of general of the Imperial army in the central portion of Asia Minor, when in 716 he usurped the empire. By his valour he saved Constantinople from the Saracens, who besieged it for nearly a year (September 717–August 718). Had he persevered in the way in which he began his reign, and devoted his whole attention to the consolidation of the empire, weakened as it was at this time as well by internal dissensions as by the Saracens, he would have been one of the most useful of the emperors who ruled at Constantinople. But the same mania for interfering in matters of religion seized him as took possession of so

[1] *L. P.*, and Paul. Diac., vi. 48. On Narni, *cf.* Miley's *Papal States*, i. p. 34.

[2] Theodosius was orthodox "ita ut hujus fidei fervore omnis ab ecclesia cessaret quæstio." *L. P.*, n. 5.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

many others of the Byzantine Cæsars; and he threw both Church and State into a ferment by his decree (726) against the worship of *images*.

It is the fashion nowadays with many authors, reversing the conclusions of former writers, always to speak of the Iconoclast emperors as *great*. They follow, at least they always quote with approval, Schlosser of Heidelberg's *History of the Iconoclast Emperors*—a work which, in the judgment of such an acknowledged learned and impartial author as Héfélé, is "as offensive through insipid argument as by prejudiced perversion of history." Acting, it would seem, on the principle, certainly erroneous, that because a man belongs to a particular party, he is therefore so prejudiced that his statements are not to be believed, authors of such deserved repute as Professor Bury begin by discounting what is told us by the 'Iconodulic chroniclers,' whose records, they are careful to remind us, are the *only* ones which have come down to us. They then proceed to enlarge, from sources, other than those of contemporary writers, on the great deeds of the Iconoclast emperors. "It is a misfortune," writes Bury (ii. 430), "that no historical or other works composed by Iconoclasts (with the exception of the *Ecloga*, which does not deal with Iconoclasm) are extant. . . ." And yet he unhesitatingly declares the Iconodules "exaggerated their (the Iconoclast emperors) faults and calumniated their moral characters." "As the Iconodulic chroniclers did not know or did not care to tell of Leo's beneficial reforms, we are left in the dark as to the details"—and one would think, from the evidence producible, as to the reforms themselves. And certainly when an effort is made to discover on what Leo's title to greatness rests, its foundations seem to be a rather vanishing quantity. He indeed saved Con-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

stantinople from the Saracens. But he was helped not only by 'an unusually severe winter,' but, as Bury informs us more than once, by the preparations for a siege that had been made by his prudent predecessor Anastasius II. Despite, however, the fearful losses the Saracens endured under the walls of Constantinople, Leo was unable to make any real headway against them. And how much better he would have been employed in trying to break their power rather than images is obvious from what Bury (ii. 405) has to write of their *constant* inroads into Asia Minor, especially *after* the year 726, the year of the edict against the images!

The *Ecloga* of Leo, of which so much is made, was only published in the *last* year of his reign (740); and was but a "handbook in Greek for popular use, containing a short compendium of the most important laws on the chief relations of life." Hence, rather to their intrinsic insignificance than to any hatred of the Isaurian emperors, "by their successors on account of their religious policy," should be attributed the fact "that none of their laws were incorporated in the great ninth century code of Basil I. and Leo VI."

Leo was certainly no respecter of the rights of conscience. To say nothing of his treatment of the image-worshippers, "four years after his accession, Leo attempted to compel all the Jews in the Empire to be baptised. . . . At the same time he tried to force the Montanists to embrace the orthodox creed" (Bury, ii. 431).

As little did he respect the pockets of his subjects. Not only did he rob the popes (732) of 3½ talents of gold (for which act there is no word of condemnation in Bury), but he increased the taxes *readily* (*ib.*, p. 423) and *heavily* (*ib.*, p. 437). As a result of his oppressions in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the domains of both mind and matter, he had to face the rebellions of Cosmas (727) and of Italy. No ruler deserves to be called great, who so little understands the first principles of government that his measures of even needful reform should bring about such results.

While Professor Bury tells us that (p. 429) the palace of Leo's son Constantine V. (Copronymus) "was constantly a scene of frivolity and festivity," he still represents him, as well as his father, as a man of elevated views. But while it may be conceded that Leo and Constantine V. by their determination of character lessened the anarchy which had preceded their administration, and hence were so far useful rulers, it is not easy to find any evidence that they were great rulers, or that the attitude they took up in the image-controversy was that of men of superior enlightenment struggling against degrading superstition. On the contrary, there would seem to be evidence that Leo, at least, attacked what he was too ignorant and uneducated to understand.

Image worship.

Here it may be observed that a history is no place for a theological treatise. It is no part of the historian's business to inquire whether the 'worship of images' is in accordance with the teachings of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; or, on broader grounds, whether it is compatible with right reason. His sole affair is to explain what exactly the Iconoclast question was, and to give its history as he would that of a political intrigue or a war. Most historians, however, who have treated of the Iconoclast or 'image breaking' controversy have indulged in long and by no means unimpassioned diatribes on the worship of images. A word or two, as calm as possible, may therefore be permitted here.

Its lawfulness.

There is no question, in the first place, that every Christian must repudiate all ideas of giving supreme honour

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to images[1] as gods or the abode of God. And certainly no Christian who has had any religious instruction whatsoever would ever dream of so doing.[2] But, it is urged, some Christians *have given* this supreme worship to images. A proposition most difficult of proof! Except by individual confessions it *can never be proved.* No amount of external signs that a man may give, apart from a verbal acknowledgment, can ever prove that he has given supreme worship to anything. The means at our command of externally showing honour are so limited that the *intensity* of the worship a person may wish to convey by the use of one or all of those means can only be gauged by one who knows the mind or intention of him who employs them. That intention can only be known by express statement. And how many Christians, it may be asked with confidence, have ever *acknowledged* that they have meant to give supreme honour to an image by any of the acts of reverence they may have shown it?

Its utility.

At any rate the ignorant *may* have rendered such adoration, and certainly by their extravagant attitude towards images they often *seem* to have given them a worship which cannot be said to be advisable. All that may be very true (though it must be borne in mind that with Eastern or more Southern peoples, very violent outward demonstration means very little), and raises the questions

[1] With Hurter (*Theol. Dogmat. Compend.*, iii. § 893) it may here be pointed out—to facilitate accuracy of thought on this subject—that an image becomes an *idol* when the material image itself is regarded as God, or when it represents some non-existing divinity or some created thing which is regarded as God. Hence a person can only be said to be an idolater if he worships an image to which he attaches one or other of these notes.

[2] And so St. Stephen (*Analecta Græca*, i. 497): "Christians have never said that the matter of the image was to be worshipped. But we honour what is represented by the image, mentally rising to its prototype."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as to whether the employment of images in religious worship is useful; and whether, if it is, the abuse does not take away the use. That images of Our Lord and His saints are useful to recall or raise even the minds of the learned to higher things can only be denied by those who have never tried their utility in that direction, or by men who have not sufficiently reflected on what creatures of sense we are. Even the learned pray with some kind of image before their mind's eye; and as the great Protestant theologian, Leibnitz,[1] closely argued, "To offer up one's adoration before an external image is no more blameworthy than to do so before the internal image in our minds. The only use of the external image is to deepen the internal one." Never was the utility of *images* as reminders more realised than at the present day. The universal use of the camera is proof enough of that. The utility of images as a means of instruction for the uneducated was clearly pointed out by St. Gregory the Great in his letter to Serenus.[2]

If, *in itself*, however, the utility[3] of images even in

[1] *Syst. Theol.*, p. 140.

[2] L. ix. 208 (105). "Idcirco enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi, qui litteras nesciunt saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quæ legere in codicibus non valent." *Cf.* xi. 10 (13) of Gregory to the same bishop. In this connection it is amusing to read (*Rome*, Gregorovius, ii. p. 222, Eng. trans.): "Enlightened bishops of Gaul regarded the idolatrous practices with displeasure. . . . When Serenus," etc. The enlightened bishops are 'Serenus' only, and Gregory had to rebuke him for fast living and consorting with bad companions!

[3] As many in this country are under the vain delusion that up to the epoch of the 'glorious reformation' our countrymen were simply idolaters, it may be of interest here to set forth what instruction was given to the people on the subject of images before that period. A very popular work, known as *Dives et Pauper*, probably issued between 1400 and 1410, says that 'images' are useful for three great ends: (1) to stir men's minds to meditate upon the Incarnation of Christ, and on His life and passion, and on the lives of the saints;

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

religious worship be conceded, does not the dreadful abuse in practice of 'image worship' render the employment of images for devotional purposes altogether undesirable? Emphatically no. In every department, abuse of good is so rampant, that even the necessary would have to be given up, if even gross abuse was always a sufficient excuse for abolishing the use of a thing. Food and drink, for instance, would be the very first things that would have to be given up! And in the case of the use of 'images,' what abuse there may have been or is in their employment, has arisen or comes, for the most part, only from the very stupid or the grossly uninstructed. And surely, in their case, it is better that they should be led by the use of images to offer a mistaken worship to God, rather than that their ignorance or stupidity should keep them from giving Him any worship at all! So much for 'image worship' in the abstract.

Images *always* used in the Church.

And now, what, as a matter of fact, has been the position the Church has taken up from the beginning with regard to the use and worship of images? Anyone can well understand that in the early ages of Christianity, when idolatry (*i.e.*, the worship of *many gods*, who were supposed, according to the more or less cultured mind of the worshipper, to be, to a less or greater degree, connected with their statues) was wellnigh universal, the Church would be very chary about the use of images. The same caution was required on account of the *early* converts from Judaism, who had a great hatred of images on account of the frequent falls of their nation into idolatry.[1]

(2) to move the heart to devotion and love; (3) to be a token and a book to the ignorant people, that they may read in imagery and painting, as clerks read in books. (*Cf.* an exhaustive analysis of this little work, ap. *Dublin Review*, Apr. 1897.)

[1] "But," says St. John Damascene (*Treatise on Images*, tr. of Miss Allies, p. 8), "now we, on the contrary, are no longer in leading

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The pagans who, we know, ever put their own construction on the little they cared to find out about Christian teaching, would, of course, have declared that the Christians worshipped *gods* as well as they did, had they seen or heard of their kneeling down and praying before a statue. But with all that, the early Christians, fully alive to the advantages of 'images' as aids to piety, did not fail to use them from the very beginning. Witness their use of images of the 'fish.'[1] They carried the 'fish' about with them in life; they had it laid by their sides in death!

Comparing the famous caricature graffito of the Crucifixion found on one of the walls of the Palace of the Cæsars on the Palatine hill, and now in the Kircherian Museum, with the common accusation of the Heathens against the Christians, viz., that they worshipped crosses,[2] proves at least that the Christians venerated crucifixes and crosses from the *earliest* times. The ardent words of St. Paul about the Cross of Christ,[3] and the fact that from the earliest ages the Christians gloried in making the 'sign[4]

strings. . . . It is given to us to avoid superstitious error." The saint seems to have written his *Orations* on the Image Question at the close of the pontificate of St. Gregory II. He dedicated his work to the Pope, to "the holy shepherd of Christ's orthodox flock, who represents in his own person Christ's priesthood" (*ib.*, p. 3). Though it may be that these words refer to Germanus, the patriarch of Constantinople, who was in the forefront of the opposition to the Iconoclast Leo.

[1] This emblem was, of course, used by the Christians, because the letters of the Greek word for fish (ἰχθύς) give in Greek the initial letters of "Jesus Christ, God's Son, Saviour." *Cf.* De Rossi, *Roma Sott.*; and Northcote and Brownlow's work in English on the same subject, vols. i. and ii.

[2] *Cf.* Min. Felix in *Oct.*, §§ 9, 12, 29; Origen, *contra Celsum*, ii. 47; and Tertullian (*Apol.*, c. 16), who says the Christians were called 'worshippers of the Cross'—'religiosi crucis.'

[3] Gal. vi. 14. "God forbid that I should glory save in the *Cross* of Our Lord Jesus Christ," etc.

[4] *Cf.* the well-known passage of Tertullian's (*De coron. milit.*, c. 3)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Cross' on themselves, quite prepare us to find a veneration for the 'image of the Cross.'

It is not, however, contended that 'image worship,' for the reasons alluded to above, made any great progress in the *public* worship of the Church till after the conversion of Constantine in the fourth century. Some will have it that the council of Elvira in Spain, held about the year 300 (306?), condemned the use of pictures in the churches.[1] After the conversion of Constantine, however, the *triumph* of Christianity in Europe, by precluding any likelihood of a general return to idolatry, rendered the introduction of images into the churches comparatively safe. Accordingly, that they were then promptly and freely introduced into the churches is scarcely called in question, as the fact is so

on this subject, where he says that "Whenever they went out or returned home, whenever they clothed or washed themselves, whenever they sat down to table or lay down to rest, they signed their foreheads with the sign of the Cross."

[1] The prohibition occurs in the 36th canon, and reads: "Placuit picturas in Ecclesiis esse non debere, ne, quod colitur et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur." Not much can be made out of this quotation by ancient or modern Iconoclasts (though the moderns, *e.g.*, Hodgkin, vi. 431, never fail to quote it), for the simple reason that it is far from clear what the canon really means. Some think it forbids 'images' to be painted on the walls of the churches, either because they might be injured by the damp and made unsightly, and so, very far from objects of devotion; or because, if persecution broke out again, the pictures could not be removed, and so the Christian religion would be insulted in those pictures. Others contend, with good show of reason, that there was question in this canon of images of God, Who of course cannot be painted as He is in Himself. For they point out that the very words of the canon show this; as they give the reason why the images must not be painted on the walls—"lest what is worshipped and adored (*i.e.*, with supreme worship, viz., God) be painted on walls." No sane man calls it in question that God cannot be represented as He is. Finally, in any case, all that can at most be extracted from the canon is that, under the circumstances—a fierce persecution was going on at the time—the Spanish bishops thought fit to forbid the introduction of images into the churches at that particular period (*cf.* Perrone's *Prælectiones Theol.*, ii. p. 440 *seq.*, ed. Paris, 1856).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

abundantly demonstrated not only by the 'very stones themselves' (*e.g.*, by the figures on sarcophagi, mosaics, etc.), but by the testimony of the Fathers.[1]

This general use of 'images' Leo III. thought to abolish by his edict of the year 726.[2] "After the tenth year of his reign," says the deacon Stephen, who wrote in 808 the life and martyrdom of St. Stephen the younger, "Leo proclaimed: 'Since the making of images is an idolatrous art, they (the images) ought not to be adored.'" It is very unfortunate that we do not know for certain the motives that impelled Leo to attack holy images. However, as Theophanes was almost contemporary with the beginnings of Iconoclasm, it will be best to follow his guidance in our efforts to get at the truth in this matter.

Leo's decree against 'image worship,' 726.

In the year 722, urged on by a lying Jew, who promised him forty years of rule (which, needless to say, he did not get), Yezid II., the Ommiade Caliph of Damascus, issued a decree[3] against the use of images in the Christian Churches of his dominions.

And we are assured that in Egypt, at any rate, the treasurer el-Habhab, in accordance with "the Caliph's order, carried out (722) a general destruction of the sacred pictures of the Christians." The Caliph's early death, however, prevented his decree from having any lasting[4] effect in his own realm. But it made an

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the well-known passage of St. Basil, *Hom.*, 17 n. 3 (*Op.*, ed. Garnier, ii. p. 141).

[2] *Indictione nona*, says an anonymous author (who flourished about 770), published by Combefis; Theoph., *Chron.*, ad an. 718, also gives the same date.

[3] *A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages*, by Stanley Lane-Poole, p. 27.

[4] Theoph., *Chron.*, ad an. 715; and the narration of the monk John, delivered to the Fathers of the Eighth General Council in their fifth session.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

impression on the uneducated[1] mind of Leo. This unfavourable impression against 'images' entertained by Leo was deepened by one Beser, who had apostatised in Syria, apparently whilst a slave. His strength of body and kindred character introduced him to the notice and friendship of Leo.[2] Then, doubtless, on the principle of hating what one has wronged, he never failed to instil into Leo his Mohammedan notions on the subject of images. Another evil adviser of the emperor was Constantine, Bishop of Nacolia, a man whom Theophanes describes[3] as thoroughly impure and ignorant. Thus, on the testimony of Theophanes, than whom on this matter we have no better authority, and whose testimony there is no reason to doubt, the two chief instigators of the Iconoclast reform (?) were an apostate and an immoral bishop!

Leo's edict of 726.

A movement against images, begun by Leo in 725, was quickened into the formal edict of 726, forbidding their use altogether, by a convulsion of nature. A terrific volcanic eruption threw up a new island in the group of the Cyclades, and covered with ashes the coasts of Asia Minor. Beser and the emperor saw in this eruption a portent urging them on.[4] Amid great commotion a famous image of Our Lord above the great gateway (known as the Brazen Gateway) of the emperor's palace was smashed to pieces. The soldier who did the deed was slain, and a tumult followed. But Leo put it down with a

[1] Theoph., *Chron.*, ad an. 718, says he was "plenus imperitiæ."

[2] Theoph., ad an. 715.

[3] *Ib.* There is no call to mention here the later Greek narratives in connection with the causes that led Leo to his attack on 'images'; nor the inventions of moderns, who ascribe his action in the matter of images to his wish to convert the Jews and Saracens.

[4] Theoph., ad an. 718; Nicephorus, *De rebus post Mauritium gestis*, also gives this account in as many words.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

strong hand, and punished its supporters with exile, mutilation[1] and confiscation. The nature of the reform desired by Leo may be gathered from the fact that his persecution was particularly directed against the noble and the learned, with the result that schools were broken up which had flourished from the days of Constantine the Great.[2]

The immediate result of Leo's decree, and perhaps also of some special heavy tax[3] which he imposed at this time (727) was a rising in Greece. One Cosmas was proclaimed emperor. A fleet of the rebels arrived off Constantinople (April 18, 727), but the dread 'Greek fire' was more than a match for it. Cosmas was executed, and the emperor raged[4] more than ever against the worshippers of images. Revolt in Greece, 727.

The same two causes brought about commotions in Italy, which were not so easily laid to rest as those in Greece; and when they had subsided, they left the imperial power in Italy a mere shadow of what it was, and that of the Pope the only one able to oppose any

[1] Theoph., ad an. 718; Vit. Steph., jun.; "Considera," writes the monk Theosterictus, soon after the year 824, "hanc (hæresim) ab imperatoria potestate fuisse ab initio valentissimam." Ap. Bolland., *Acta SS.*, April 3.

[2] "Imprimis autem in eos (animadversum fuerit) qui genere et doctrina clarebant, adeo ut scholæ una cum sacra doctrina exciderint, quæ a sæculo sancti Constantini magni usque ad ea tempora floruerant." Theoph., *ib.* Latin version.

[3] Chronologists have often called attention to the fact that from 727 to 774 the indictions and the 'anno mundi' in Theophanes do not tally. Most chronologists have got into the habit of accepting his 'years of the indiction,' and rejecting his 'years of the world.' But Bury (*Later Roman Emp.*, ii. pp. 425-7) gives some good reasons for adopting the other course, and he supposes that probably for fiscal reasons an indiction was suppressed; so that 727 represents the 10th to the 12th indiction. By this device Leo would probably get two years' taxes in one!

[4] Theoph., ad an. 718. Nicephorus, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

resistance to the Lombards, who took occasion of the disorder to still further enlarge their territory.

Attempts on the Pope's life, 725-6-7.

On the authority of Theophanes, as has been said above, it was in the year 725 that Leo first began to make a movement against the use of 'images.' Probably in the same year, whether on their own authority, with a view of hereafter gaining Leo's favour, or at his direct command, as the *Book of the Popes* expressly[1] states, a certain duke Basil, the Cartularius (assessor) Jordanes, and a subdeacon Lurion formed a conspiracy to kill the Pope. This conspiracy received the encouragement of Marinus, who had been sent from Constantinople to govern the Duchy of Rome. The unfolding of the plot was checked for a time by the enforced departure from Rome of Marinus in consequence of illness. When Paul came as exarch (726–7) into Italy, the conspirators resumed their work. But the Romans, discovering their dark designs, extinguished them in the blood of their authors.[2]

Meanwhile, in the latter half of the year 726, there was published, in Constantinople, Leo's edict against the use of 'images' in the churches, and likely enough, at the same time, notice of a very heavy special tax, for the purposes of which Bury supposes[3] that the emperor suppressed a year of the indiction. Apparently, and as might be expected, the notice of the exorbitant tax was the first to reach Italy. As a leader "of a lawful opposition to the tyranny of imperial administration,"[4] Gregory contended against the imposition of the said tax. And

[1] Basilius . . . . Jordanes . . . . et Lurion consilium inierunt, ut Pontificem interficerent. Quibus assensum Marinus . . . . *imperatore* mandante hoc probavit." *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.*

[3] *Cf. sup.*, p. 183, note 3.

[4] Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Emp.*, p. 64.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

because he did so,[1] the exarch, at the command of the emperor, began to concert measures for taking Gregory's life, putting another in his place, and plundering his churches. An army was accordingly despatched from Ravenna to carry out these tyrannical intentions. But that they should be put into execution suited neither the Romans nor the Lombards. The Lombards did not wish any increase of the power of the exarch; and the Romans were resolved that no harm should come to their beloved Pope. Combined Roman[2] and Lombard forces therefore caused the exarch's army to return without accomplishing its purpose.

Leo's decrees against 'images' arrive in Italy, 727.

At length, after this repulse of the exarch,[3] the emperor's decrees against 'images' were published in his Italian dominions, perhaps at the end of the year 726, but probably at the very beginning of 727. The Pope was informed that if he interfered with these decrees, as he had in the matter of the tax, he would be degraded. On the contrary, if he acquiesced he would meet with the emperor's favour.[4] At once Italy was in a storm!

[1] "Paulus . . . . Imperatoris jussione . . . . Pontificem conabatur interficere . . . . eo quod censum in provincia ponere præpediebat," etc. *L. P.*

[2] "Sed motis Romanis atque undique Longobardis pro defensione Pontificis in Salario ponte Spoletini, atque hinc inde Duces Longobardorum circumdantes Romanorum fines hoc præpedierunt." *Ib.* Of course it may have been that the Lombards of *Central Italy*, who seem to have been the principal movers in this affair, supported the Pope, as they wished his support against the king, of whom they wished to be independent; or, again, motives of common humanity *may* have urged the Lombards to the course they took in this matter. As far as any certainty is concerned, we are really in the dark as to the secret springs of the action of the Lombards of Mid-Italy at this period.

[3] "Jussionibus itaque *postmodum* missis, decreverat Imperator, ut nulla imago," etc. *Ib.*

[4] "Si acquiesceret in hoc (decreto) Pontifex gratiam Imperatoris haberet; si *et hoc* fieri præpediret, a suo gradu decideret" (*ib.*).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Pope, whose "political and ecclesiastical position entitled him to make a direct opposition to Iconoclasm,"[1] at once took action, and wrote[2] in all directions to warn the people against the teachings of the emperor. The subjects of the empire took more decided measures. They flew to arms in defence of the Pope; they anathematised the exarch and the one who had commissioned him; and consulted for their own safety and liberty by electing dukes for themselves all over Italy.[3] They even resolved to elect an emperor for themselves and to lead him to Constantinople. But this intention Gregory contrived to divert,[4] as he hoped for the conversion of the emperor. In the midst of this general defection, some, of course, took up the emperor's cause; among others the Duke Exhilaratus, on insufficient authority sometimes called the Duke of Naples. He marched on Rome with his son Hadrian, calling on the people to obey Leo and kill the Pope. The people replied by killing *him*. In Ravenna also Paul, the exarch, tried to form a party for the emperor, and he also was slain in the tumult that ensued (727).[5]

The Lombards take Ravenna, etc., 727.

Now, of course, was the time for the Lombards. They

[1] Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Emp.*, p. 46.

[2] "Scribens ubique cavere se Christianos" (*L. P.*).

[3] "Omnes Pentapolenses atque Venetiarum exercitus Imperatoris jussionem restiterunt; . . . . ubique in Italia Duces elegerunt," etc. *Ib.* The Lombard deacon (vi. 49) is in general accord with all this narrative.

[4] "Omnis Italia consilium iniit, ut sibi eligerent Imperatorem . . . . sed compescuit tale consilium Pontifex." *L. P.* *Cf.* Paul. Diac., *H. L.*, vi. 49.

[5] *L. P.* The Duke of Rome, Peter, was also driven out of the city for taking part against the Pope—the same (?) Peter who opposed Pope Constantine. *L. P.* Vid. *sup.*, p. 137. Hadrian, it should be noted, probably had a personal spite against the Pope, as Gregory had had to excommunicate him (*cf.* canons 14 and 15 of the Roman Council of 721) for an unlawful marriage with a deaconess.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

availed themselves of it. In the first place Ravenna itself fell into their hands. Both from the *Book of the Popes* and the Lombard deacon,[1] it is certain that Liutprand took and destroyed Classis, the harbour of Ravenna, and besieged Ravenna itself. That siege *seems* to have occurred (717) some years before the capture of Narni, and not to have resulted in the capture of the city. It is certain, however, that Ravenna was captured somewhere about this time, as particulars of its capture are given by Agnellus,[2] and of its recapture by John the Deacon[3] (who wrote some 250 years after this) and Paul the Deacon.[4] *When* it was actually taken cannot be laid down with any certainty. But from the first letter of Gregory to the emperor, of which more hereafter, it would appear that Ravenna fell into the power of the Lombards for a short time in the year 727. There also fell, without much difficulty, under the rule of the Lombards, the Pentapolis—or the district around the five cities of Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Ancona, and Umana—and various other places. Among others, Liutprand seized (727–8) Sutri,[5] an important town in the Roman Duchy on the Cassian road. This place, however, in response to the entreaties and money of

[1] VI. 49.

[2] In his life of St. John, 39th Bishop of Ravenna; *cf.* note to vi. 49 in Migne's ed. of Paul the Deacon; and Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 728. Agnellus, c. 1 (ap. Murat., *R. I. S.*, II. i.) concludes: "Inimici ingressi civitatem et eam subverterunt." Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. p. 412), who rejects the two letters of Gregory II. to Leo, and who cannot believe that the biographer of Gregory II., with his political leanings, would omit to notice the capture of Ravenna, but that the non-political biographer of Gregory III. might, assigns this capture to the reign of Gregory III., but before 735.

[3] *Cron. Venez. Antichis.*, i. p. 95, ed. Monticolo. *Cf.* Hodgkin, vi. p. 487 f.

[4] VI. 54.

[5] *Cf.* Miley's *Hist. of the Papal States*, i. 71.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Pope, the Lombard restored "to the apostles Peter and Paul."[1]

Council in Rome against Iconoclasm, 727.

Meanwhile, besides thus doing what he could to check the encroachments of the Lombards, Gregory did not neglect to take steps to hinder the spread of the new heresy. Besides writing the warning letters we have alluded to, but of the contents of which we know nothing, he called a council in Rome (towards the close of 727) to deliberate on the best measures to be adopted to counteract the evil. This synod is spoken of by Pope Hadrian I. in the letter[2] which he wrote to Charlemagne (794) in answer to his 'capitular' (the Caroline books). Pope Hadrian quotes a little of Gregory's speech to the Fathers of this council. Among other points, the Pope insisted[3] "that images and pictures must be so kept and loved that their usefulness might not be spoilt by contempt, and this irreverence redound to the injury of those whose images they are; and that, on the other hand, the integrity of the faith might not be hurt by excessive worship; and that too much honour given to material things might not be an argument that we think too little of spiritual." Several of the Pope's arguments "have so great a similarity with some passages of the two letters (yet to be spoken of) of Gregory

[1] "Sed Pontificis multis continuis scriptis atque commonitionibus ad Regem missis, quamvis multis datis muneribus, ... castrum (Sutriense) donationem b. App. Petro et Paulo . . . . Rex restituit atque donavit" (*L. P.*). This *restitution* is dated in the *L. P.* 11th indiction, and was made probably in the beginning of the year 728. Some see in it the beginning of the 'temporal power.'

[2] Ap. Mansi, xiii. 759. Labbe, vii. 947, etc. A fragment of the acts of this council has been published by Card. Mai (*Spicil. Rom.*, vi.). This synod is also spoken of by the *Liber Synodicus*, Zonaras and Cedrenus. *Cf.* Héfélé, Eng. trans., v. 301.

[3] This lucid pronouncement on the image question of Pope Gregory was cited in the council of 769, held by Pope Stephen IV., a fragment of which was preserved by Albinus (fl. 1184), and is printed by Mai, *ubi sup.*, p. xvi.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to the emperor, that we may suppose that Gregory delivered in the synod the principal part of what he wrote to the emperor.[1] But what did he write to the emperor? This question brings us to the two famous letters of Gregory to Leo. There are to be found appended to the Acts of the Seventh General Council two letters in Greek, letters which were not read at that council, but which, first found by the Jesuit scholar Fronto Ducæus, were added to the Acts of the Seventh General Council as pertaining thereto, and purporting to be from Pope Gregory II. to Leo III. Up till comparatively recently these letters had always been accepted as genuine. Now their authenticity, on what seem to us insufficient grounds, has been called in question by Duchesne, Hodgkin, etc. While it is allowed that the 'documentary testimony' in their favour is fair —for MSS. copies of the letters, dating as far back as perhaps the tenth century have been found—it is urged that the internal evidence furnished by the letters is against their genuineness. Such evidence must be strong before it can suffice to upset what has been long accepted, and for which there is satisfactory external evidence. The chief argument against the authenticity of the letters is their alleged coarseness. No doubt there is some plain speaking in them. But if it is a question of balancing the very courtly style of Pope Gregory I. to Maurice or Phocas, with the unpolished directness of the letters in question to the uneducated Leo, one ought rather to prefer the latter, and be thankful that the times and the man were such as to permit of a rude tyrant, who was interfering with conscience,[2] being told the simple truth in unvarnished language.

[1] Héfélé, *ib.* That Gregory did write to Leo is what we might have been sure of *a priori*, and what we are informed by Theophanes (ad ann. 717, 721).

[2] St. John Damascene (*On Images*, p. 76 of the tr. of Miss Allies) upbraids his opponents for following "a gospel . . . . of Leo. I do

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

First letter of the Pope to Leo, 727.

The first letter,[1] then, of Gregory to Leo on the subject of Iconoclasm was despatched at the close of the year 727,[2] and was to the following effect. The Pope began by reminding Leo that in ten letters he had promised to observe the doctrines of the Fathers. "If anyone removes the ordinances of the Fathers," said you, "let him be anathema." For ten years sacred images have not been mentioned by you. Now you say, "they take the part of idols," and you add (Exod. xx. 4): "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing," etc. "But why have you not questioned wise men on this subject before disturbing and perplexing poor people? You could then have learnt of what kind of images God gave that command." . . . . "I am forced[3] to write to you in a rough simple style, as you yourself are uneducated and uncultivated." The Pope then shows that God, who gave the command about not making graven things (of a certain kind), yet Himself ordered their making for His worship (Exod. xxv. *seq.*); and that men who had seen Our Lord and His martyrs, made pictures of thèm for others, who, leaving the worship of the devil, venerated these images, not absolutely (with the worship of *latria*), but relatively. . . .[4]

not admit," he adds, "an emperor's tyrannical action in domineering over the Church."

[1] The other arguments against the authenticity of these letters are treated of in an Appendix.

[2] On the date of this letter see the close reasoning of Héfélé, *Hist. of the Councils*, v. 298-301. The translation of the letter given in Héfélé, *ib.*, 298 f., is here freely used.

[3] One of the objected coarse passages: "ἀνάγκην ἔχομεν γράψαι σοι παχέα καὶ ἀναίδευτα, ὥσπερ εἶ ἀναίδευτος καὶ παχύς."

[4] "οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀφέντες τὰς προσκυνήσεις τοῦ διαβόλου, ταύτας προσέκευνησαν οὐ λατρευτικῶς ἀλλα σχετικως." Many authors, who make profession of understanding much more recondite matters, boggle at the distinction between absolute and relative honour. But everybody understands that, while he may be attached to the portrait of a mother, the love he has for it is very different from that which he has for the mother herself. Give two Greek names to these two different degrees

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"You say: We worship stones and walls and boards. But it is not so, O Emperor; but they serve us for remembrance and encouragement, lifting our slow spirits upwards, by those whose names the pictures bear and whose representations they are. And we worship them not as God, as you maintain, God forbid! . . . ." Stop, continues the Pope, the scandal you are causing. "Even the little children mock at you. Go into one of their schools, say that you are the enemy of images, and straightway they will throw their little tablets at your head,[1] and what you have failed to learn from the wise you may pick up from the foolish. You wrote: 'As the Jewish King Ozias cast the brazen serpent out of the temple after eight hundred years (2 Kings xviii. 4), so I after eight hundred years cast the images out of the Churches.' Yes, Ozias was your brother, and, like you, did violence to the priests.[2] . . . . In virtue of the power which has come down to us from St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, we might inflict a punishment upon you, but since you have invoked one on yourself,[3] have that, you and the counsellors you have chosen, ... though you have so excellent a high priest, our brother Germanus, whom you ought to have taken into your counsels as father and teacher. . . . The dogmas of the Church are not

of love, and remember that it is with honour as with love, and then—behold the mystery!

[1] This is, of course, one of the 'low' passages. But who will say that the remark was not well deserved?

[2] II. Paralip. xxvi. 19. "Ozias . . . . threatened the priests." There is some blundering here, either on the part of the Pope or the emperor. It was the good king *Ezechias* who "broke the brazen serpent." Perhaps it was the emperor's mistake, as the Pope says, "you wrote," etc., and it did not suit the Pope's purpose or argument to correct the mistake.

[3] See above, where Leo says, "If any one removes the ordinances of the Fathers, let him be anathema."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a matter for the emperor, but for the bishops." The Pope then goes on to point out some of the unhappy consequences of the emperor's conduct; he tells how, when news of the destruction of the figure of Our Lord at the Brazen Gate, and of the subsequent massacres, had reached the West, the imperial laurel-crowned busts (*laureata*) were smashed and the Lombards took advantage of the general confusion to seize even Ravenna. But you say, "I will carry off Pope Gregory a prisoner as Constans (II.) did Martin." After pointing out what would be the folly of such a proceeding, as he acts as a peacemaker between the East and West, Gregory adds that in any case he has only to go a few miles[1] out of Rome and then the emperor might just as well pursue the wind. "Would that it might be the will of God, that Pope Martin's lot might be mine." "Still," adds the Pope, "as, though quite unworthy, the whole West trusts in us, and in St. Peter, whom men here regard as an earthly god,[2] I am willing to live."

Second letter of Pope Gregory, 728.

That the emperor replied to the above letter we know from the second letter of the Pope, in which he expresses his grief that the emperor has made it clear by his letter that he (the emperor) has not changed his attitude towards

[1] The 'three miles' (24 stadia) that the Pope speaks of have been a great difficulty to most historians, because they have made up their minds that the Pope intended to fly to the Lombards, and they cannot believe that the Lombard territory came within three miles of Rome at that time. But the cue to the meaning of the Pope's words is found towards the close of the letter, where the Pope says that the emperor cannot protect the Roman duchy, but only the city of *Rome*, because his ships—his only power—can get at it. "Scis Romam defendere imperium tuum non posse, nisi forte *solam urbem propter adjacens illi mare ac navigia*" (Latin version). Hence, out of Rome, the Pope is safe from the emperor.

[2] Fond indeed of "making mountains out of mole hills" must historians be to write as follows (Gregorovius, *Hist. of Rome*, ii. p. 232, note): "Peter was thus explained to be God, and that by the Pope himself!!" After that the deluge!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

holy images and refuses to follow even the Greek Fathers. Again the Pope reminds Leo that doctrines are matters not for emperors but for bishops, who "have the mind (*νοῦν*) of Christ. . . . . You persecute and tyrannise over us with military and physical force. We, unarmed and defenceless, ... invoke the Leader of armies, ... Jesus Christ, that he may send thee a demon, according to that of the apostle (1 Cor. v. 5), 'deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of Our Lord Jesus Christ.'" . . . . "You ask," continues Gregory, quoting from the emperor's reply, "how it was that nothing was decreed about images in the six general councils." For the same reason, retorts the Pope, that it was not decreed that bread had to be eaten and water drunk. Men had as much the habit of venerating images as they had of eating bread and drinking water. Gregory might have added that at least by the Quinisext Council, which the Greeks classed with the Sixth General Council, the *worship of images* was practically recognised, for it decreed respect to the Cross. "Reverence for the holy cross requires that the form of the cross shall never be found on the floor, so that it may never be trodden under foot" (can. 73). In conclusion the Pope prays for the emperor's conversion, and that all may be brought back into the one true fold of Christ.

Gregory exerts himself for the recovery of Ravenna, 727.

Much about the same time that Gregory wrote his first letter to Leo on image worship (viz., towards the end of 727), he wrote to Ursus,[1] doge of Venice, and to Antoninus, patriarch of Grado, in the same terms, urging them to stand by the exarch (that must be the new exarch

[1] The letter to Ursus is to be found in Dandolo's *Chronicle*, ap. Murat., *R. I. S.*, xii.; Mansi, xii. 244, etc.; the other in the *Chronicle* of John the Deacon, ap. Pertz, *M. G. SS.*, vii. 12; or *Cron. Venez.*, i., ed. Monticolo.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Eutychius), who, the Pope heard,[1] was in Venice, and in his (the Pope's) stead to fight with the 'unspeakable' Lombards (they were probably then holding Sutri) for the recovery of Ravenna. Ravenna was, in fact, retaken, probably in the early part of the year 728, after it had only been in the hands of the Lombards for a month or two, which may account for its speedy recovery. It may be thought, from all the events we have assigned to the year 727, that things must have moved quickly at that time. Probably, from the energetic character of the principal agents, Leo and Gregory, they did. Even the exarch Eutychius seems to have been a man of more enterprise than most of those who had preceded him in his office.

Eutychius makes an attempt on the Pope's life, 728.

After the recapture of Ravenna, Eutychius, at the command of the emperor, proceeded to Naples, whence it was thought he might the more easily operate against the Pope, and effect what had so often been attempted in vain before. Accordingly the exarch sent an emissary to Rome, with instructions to compass the death of the Pope and the chief nobility. The plot transpired, and, but for the interposition of the Pope, its author would have been slain. Indignant at what had occurred, the citizens, great and small, bound themselves by oath to die rather than suffer their noble bishop to be harmed in any way. Not to be baulked, Eutychius endeavoured by promise of liberal presents to the king and the dukes of the Lombards to turn them against the Pope. In vain. Romans and Lombards "bound themselves together with the bonds of faith,"[2]

[1] "Exarchus, ut cognovimus, apud Venetias moratur; . . . . cum eo nostra vice (debeat nobilitas tua) decertare." Gundlach, who has also edited these letters (ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. p. 702), gives in a note the various theories which have been entertained as to their authorship and even authenticity.

[2] *L. P.*, from which this paragraph is taken almost verbally. "Sed ne desisterent ab amore vel fide Romani imperii, ammonebat."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

declaring they were ready to die rather than that harm should come to such a glorious champion of the Christian faith. But, adds the papal biographer, the Pope placed greater trust in the abundant alms he gave to the poor, and in prayer and fasting, to which he earnestly devoted himself. And while thanking the people for their good-will, he exhorted them to be earnest in the faith, and in the performance of good works, and begged them "not to swerve from the love and fidelity which they owed to the Roman Empire." Certainly it was not the Pope's fault if the Roman people at this epoch threw off the yoke of a rotten empire, which, utterly unable to protect them from the foreigner, could only find strength to try and wring from them their money or their faith. With the facts of history and any elementary knowledge of ethics to guide them, it is truly wonderful how certain English authors descant about the loyalty *due*[1] (?) from the Pope and the Italian people to the emperor at this time—Englishmen who, of course, do not believe in any 'divine right of kings' who govern well, let alone who govern wrongly.

Leo and St Germanus, 728–729.

In the East, the emperor continued to work for the establishment of his heresy. He tried, privately at first (728), to gain over the holy patriarch Germanus to publish a declaration in favour of the destruction of images, knowing well that if he succeeded with him his work would be more than half done. The attempt failed, and Germanus notified it to the Pope. Gregory at once wrote[2] (728) to

[1] Of course there are some who speak in a more manly way. Gibbon (*Decline*, etc., iii. c. 49), when treating of these affairs, remarks of the temporal dominion of the popes, that "their noblest title is the free choice of a people whom they had redeemed from slavery." It may be noted here, that, in the light of modern scholarship, much of this chapter of Gibbon's stands in need of rewriting.

[2] His letter is to be found among the documents of the fourth session of the Seventh General Council, ap. Mansi, xiii.; Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 317 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the patriarch to tell him the joy that his (Germanus') 'honourable letter' had brought him. He feels that he must write and greet Germanus, his brother, and champion of the Church, and praise him for the struggle he has so nobly maintained—a struggle which has left the emperor defeated. Then the Pope goes on to show that Germanus acted rightly in defending the use of holy images, as honour rendered to an image passes on to what it represents. "If God had not become man we should not represent Him in human form." . . . . "The images of those things which do not exist, the inventions of pagan poetry, are called idols." . . . . "The Church of Christ has nothing to do with idols." . . . . "Christians[1] only worship and adore with the worship of 'latria' the Blessed Trinity." . . . . "If, however, anyone in Jewish fashion (a reference doubtless to the Jewish advisers or proclivities of the emperor), misusing the words of the Old Testament which were of old directed against idolatry, accuses our Church of idolatry, we can only hold him for a barking dog." Then, very pointedly, Gregory proceeds to urge that if only the Jews themselves had paid more attention to the 'images' which were used in their own worship—the rod of Moses, the ark, the tabernacle, the cherubim, etc.—they would not have so often turned to idolatry. By the prayers of the Mother of God, and all the saints, Gregory in conclusion trusts that Germanus may long be preserved to teach the way of truth, learnt from the Fathers.

Leo deposes the patriarch Germanus, 729-30.

Leo was not, however, at the end of his resources. He tried to crush the resolution of Germanus by breaking him when in contact with already 'broken reeds.' Acting like our own tyrants, Henry I. with St. Anselm and Henry II. with St. Thomas of Canterbury, he

[1] κατηγορείτω μηδείς, ὅτι μηδὲν τῶν ὄντων τὸ ὄνομα . . . ὁ λαὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . . πλὴν τῆς ἁγίας . . . . τριάδος ἐσεβάσθη, ἢ ἐλατρευσε.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

brought Germanus before a council (called by the Greeks a 'Silentium'—a very good name, as a general rule, for an assembly presided over by the 'master of many legions') composed of his creatures, both cleric and lay (729, or January 7, 730). Germanus was not to be overawed, but, finding he could effect no good, he took off his pallium, the mark of his archiepiscopal dignity, saying: "If I am Jonas, cast me into the sea. Without the authority[1] of a general council, O emperor, no innovation can I make in matters of faith." Then, adds the chronicler, Germanus retired to his ancestral home and passed the few remaining years of his old age in retirement. And his ambitious disciple Anastasius, who for power had sacrificed his conscience, was made patriarch in his stead (January 22, 730). But, of course, both he and his synodal letter were rejected by Pope Gregory,[2] who threatened to depose him if he did not renounce his heresy.

Alliance between the exarch and Liutprand, 729.

Whilst Leo in the East was persecuting the orthodox with mutilation and death,[3] his exarch was pushing his cause in Italy. Eutychius had at last managed to bring

[1] "Absque universalis etenim concilii auctoritate, imperator, circa fidem quidquam innovare non valeo" (Theoph., *Chron.*, ad an. 721, Latin version). With Theophanes on all this affair, cp. Nicephorus and the life of St. Stephen the Younger. "And now," says the great contemporary champion of the holy images, "holy Germanus, shining by word and example, has been punished and become an exile, and many more bishops and fathers whose names are unknown to us" (St. John Damascene, *Treatise on Images*, p. 70 of Miss Allies' translation).

[2] Theoph., *ib.*; the *L. P.* says: "Rescriptis commonitoriis nisi ad Catholicam converteretur fidem, etiam extorrem a sacerdotali officio esse mandavit."

[3] *L. P.* "Aliquanti capite truncati, alii partem corporis excisi." Theoph. (*ib.*), "multi clerici et monachi et devoti laici . . . . martyrii corona fuerint redimiti." *Cf.* Ep. 86 of Nicholas I. to the emperor Michael, ap. Migne, t. 119, p. 930.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

about an alliance with the Lombard king, on the understanding that they were to help one another, till Liutprand reduced to complete subjection the almost independent dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, and till Eutychius was able to work his will at Rome.[1] Liutprand, with his usual adroitness, got what he wanted done first. Then the two armies marched on Rome, and encamped on the plain of Nero, between the Vatican hill, Monte Mario and the Tiber. But again the personal influence of a Pope saved Rome. Perhaps from what we have already seen of the character of Liutprand, it was not very hard to persuade him to abandon the cause of the exarch. However that may be, Gregory so moved the Lombard king that he threw himself on his knees before the Pope and promised not to harm anyone. Then, after laying down before the body of St. Peter his royal mantle, his spear, and his crown, and reconciling the exarch to the Pope, he withdrew his troops.[2]

Rebellion of Petasius, 730.

As though for the one purpose of bringing into still clearer relief the forgiving nature of the Pope, whilst the exarch was in Rome a certain Petasius, taking the name of Tiberius, raised the standard of revolt in Tuscany against the emperor. He gained the adhesion of certain towns, such as Barberano, Bieda and Luna, an old Etruscan city in the territory of Bieda or Blera. The exarch was alarmed; but encouraged by the Pope, and aided by a body of troops, with which Gregory furnished him, Eutychius slew Petasius and sent his head to Constantinople. "Even with this, the emperor did not look upon the Romans with favour," concludes the *Liber Pontificalis*. The popes were loyal to a fault!

[1] *L. P.*

[2] This and the following paragraph, almost verbatim from the *L. P.*, *i.e.*, of course as far as the narrative is concerned.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

It may be well to remark again that the order of events, as set forth above, is at best but conjectural. All that can be said for it is that it has been arranged after a very careful study of the original sources, and of many eminent modern authorities. As far as its author can see, the chronological sequence that he has given above, if it rests on some suppositions, does not *contradict* anything the most reliable of the ancients have told us, and has the merit of not arbitrarily altering the order in which the *Book of the Popes* (our best authority) has related the incidents of Gregory's life, and is in general accord with the views of some of the best modern authorities. Much would be done towards settling the chronological and other difficulties of Gregory's pontificate if only the date of the capture of Ravenna could be definitely fixed. But, unless some fresh documents are brought to light, it does not seem possible to determine the said date with certainty. No doubt, what with the emperor and his exarch being more intent on forcing heresy on their Italian subjects than in resisting the Lombards; what with the Pope having to resist the Lombards with physical force, and the emperor with moral; and what with the Lombards now apparently favouring and now opposing both the emperor and the Pope, and now acting in unison and now at variance one with the other, no doubt some of the historians themselves of those times were as much in the dark as we are as to the true state of things.

In the account of the beginnings of Iconoclasm given above, nothing has been said of what the Greek historians unanimously relate as to the excommunication of the emperor by the Pope. Theophanes,[1] *e.g.*, after assuring us that in consequence of Leo's Iconoclasm Gregory

[1] Ad ann. 717, 721.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

prevented Italy and Rome from paying taxes, twice asserts that the Pope "separated Rome and Italy and the whole of the West from political and ecclesiastical obedience to Leo and from his Empire." But the testimony of *later* ill-informed Greeks is not to be compared with the opposite evidence of the *contemporary Liber Pontificalis*, and the Lombard, Paul the Deacon. The later Latins, who have mentioned these stories, have copied them from Theophanes. And it is very clear that the idea of Gregory excommunicating the emperor has been drawn from that passage in the Pope's second letter, where Gregory, quoting St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 5), prays that for the salvation of his soul God will send the emperor a demon. The Pope's resisting the imposition of the extraordinary tax (the 'census' or poll-tax of the *L. P.*), and his opposition to the emperor's Iconoclastic decree, have been magnified into his forbidding the payment of *any* taxes and separating Italy from political subjection to Leo.[1]

Death of Gregory, Feb. 731.

The day at length came when the storms in which he had passed his important and glorious pontificate broke unheeded over Gregory's head. His mortal remains were laid to rest in St. Peter's, February 11, 731. Both ancient and fair-minded modern authors join in praising the character of Gregory. To the Greek Theophanes he was as illustrious for his deeds as for his learning; to Hodgkin[2] he had "much of the true Roman feeling which had animated his great namesake and predecessor"; and to Finlay[3] he "was a man of sound judgment as well as an able and zealous priest."

[1] *Cf. Temporal Power of the Popes*, by Gosselin, i. p. 197 (Eng. trans.).

[2] *Italy*, etc., vi. 460.

[3] *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 46.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Gregory's policy.

And certainly during the trying years of Gregory's pontificate there was need of a Pope of sound judgment. He was in the midst of keen and grasping foes. There were Lombard dukes and Lombard kings eager to seize on Rome or its territory; and exarchs of Ravenna wishful to wring from him his faith or his life. The emperor at Constantinople, who ought to have been his strongest support, was his worst oppressor. Great must have been his temptation to throw in his lot with Liutprand or with his practically independent dukes! But throughout he displayed loyalty and good sense. He would not favour an ambitious duke against his king, nor show himself a rebel against a tyrannical sovereign. He steered a straight course, and it brought him to harbour with safety and with profit. He kept faith with Leo whilst all around him were falling away from their allegiance and were everywhere choosing 'dukes' for themselves. He caused territory to be restored, and put down those who raised themselves up against the Isaurian despot. Despite of this, Gregory became in practice ruler of the Duchy of Rome. Virtue, in his case, proved its own reward. The exarch could not break through the ring of friends who surrounded Rome and the popes. Liutprand would only restore what he had seized to 'Blessed Peter.' Before the close of his reign, then, Gregory, without failing in loyalty, but by the force of circumstances—the oppressive taxation and meddling theology of Leo the Isaurian — became the sovereign power in Rome.

Decree about Mass.

In the midst of all his difficulties, Gregory found time to devote to church repairs and endowments, as we have noticed before, and to attend to the Church's liturgy. He decreed that in *Lent*, on the *Thursdays* the fast should be observed as on the rest of the days of the week, and that Mass should be said publicly in the churches, though

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

these things were not wont to be done before,[1] because Thursdays used to be specially honoured by the Pagans in their worship of Jupiter. But Walfrid Strabo (†849), in his work, *De divinis officiis* (c. 20), says that even before the time of Gregory II. Mass was celebrated on the Thursdays in Lent, but that Gregory appointed *proper* offices for those days, for before his time the Mass of the Sunday immediately preceding was wont to be used on the said Thursdays. Cardinal Bona[2] would reconcile the two statements by supposing that till Gregory's decree there was no assembly of the faithful on the Thursdays.

Gregory is commemorated as a saint in the Roman calendar and martyrology on February 13th. Some martyrologies give his feast on the 11th February.

[1] *L. P.* *Cf.* Pagi, *B. Gest.*, in vit., § 41, from whom this paragraph is taken. Pope Melchiades had forbidden the faithful to fast on Sundays or Thursdays, because the pagans fasted on those days. *Cf.* *L. P.*, in vit. Melch. And in this connection we find 'certain Catholics' condemned by the 15th canon of the council of Narbonne, held in 589, for celebrating Thursday in honour of 'Jupiter,' as though that day were consecrated to him.

[2] *De Rebus Liturgicis*, i. c. 18 n. 2. Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 412) notes that in the Gregorian Sacramentary, *stational* Masses are set down for Thursdays as well as for the other days; whereas in the Gelasian they are set down for the other days in Lent, but not for the Thursdays.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

GREGORY III.

A.D. 731–741.

Sources.—The 'life' in the *L. P.* is not nearly so important as that of Gregory II. A great portion of it is taken up with lists of gifts to and repairs of churches. The other sources are much the same as for Gregory II. In the 'life' of Pope Zachary in the *L. P.*, there is some material for the last few years of Gregory III. In this biography, and in many a subsequent one, there will be frequently quoted the famous *Codex Carolinus*. The Caroline Code, so called because it was drawn up by the order of Charlemagne, consists of ninety-nine letters of Gregory III., Zachary, Stephen (II.) III., Paul I., Stephen (III.) IV., Hadrian I., and the anti-pope Constantine. Originally written on papyrus, like the other papal letters of this period, these letters of the popes to Charles Martel, Pippin or Charlemagne, were by the orders of the last named copied with the greatest care and exactness (*summo cum certamine*), "in order," as the preamble of the code has it, "that no testimony which might benefit Holy Church might be wanting to his successors." As they are found in the *C. Code*, the letters are undated and apparently not even arranged in chronological sequence. Hence the dates assigned to them are more or less conjectural. What data there are in them which can be used for chronological purposes have been well set forth by Jaffé and Gundlach (p. 471), in their editions of the *C. C.* The only MS. at all ancient of this valuable document is in the imperial library at Vienna. It was written out at the end of the ninth century, and belonged to Willibert, Archbishop of Cologne (870–889). The *C. C.* has been edited several times. One of the better and more recent editions, that

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Cenni, has been reproduced by Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98. The best two editions are those of Jaffé (who closely examined the Vienna MS. himself), *Monumenta Carolina* (Berlin, 1867), and of Gundlach, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. For further information on the *C. C.*, read the introductions of the two last-named authors.

Modern works.—The Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages, by M. Gosselin, Eng. trans., i. p. 197 *seq.*; Bartolini, *S. Zaccaria Papa*, p. xlii. f.

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Leo III. 716–741.	Liutprand, 712–744.	Eutychius, 727–752; apparently the last of the exarchs.

Gregory Pope, 731.

GREGORY, the son of the very distinctive 'John,' a Syrian, and known to the Romans as Gregory the Younger[1] the Second, was elected Pope (February 11, 731) by popular acclamation. He was following in the funeral procession of his saintly predecessor, when, "moved by divine inspiration,"[2] the whole body of the people uprose, carried him off, and elected him Pope. For some cause he was not consecrated till March 18. For *Anastasius*, in the life of Gregory II., says that after his (Gregory II.'s) death the see was vacant for thirty-five days.

The Pope sends admonitory letters to Leo, 731.

As the bitterness of Leo[3] against the upholders of 'image worship' was steadily increasing, the first thing that the Pope did was to address him letters of re-

[1] "Qui et vulgarica Romanorum lingua dicitur junior secundus." *Cf.* Willibald, *Vit. S. Bonif.*, c. 5, with c. 7, ed. Jaffé, pp. 26, 37.

[2] *L. P.*

[3] "Ea persecutione grassante, quæ per ipsos (Leo and his son Constantine), mota est ad . . . . destructionem sacrarum imaginum," etc. *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

monstrance, as Gregory II. had done. These letters were entrusted to a priest named George, whose name appears in connection with the Roman Council of 721. But being a man rather wanting in courage, he returned to Rome without having dared to present them to the emperor. Great was the indignation of the Pope when George returned to him the undelivered letters, and he would have degraded him from his sacred office.

First synod at Rome under Gregory III., 731.

However, at the intercession of the nobility and of the fathers of a council which the Pope had called to consider this matter, George was simply subjected to a suitable penance and again sent with the letters to Constantinople. But he was not allowed to get there. He was seized by the emperor's orders in Sicily and sent into banishment.

Second synod.

Hereupon Gregory took stronger measures. He summoned[1] a council to meet in Rome on November 1, 731. Ninety-three bishops took part in the synod held at the tomb or *confession* of St. Peter. The whole of the Roman clergy were also present at the synod, as also the 'noble consuls' and the people. It was decreed, in accordance with the decrees of previous popes and the belief of antiquity, that "if anyone,[2] for the future, shall take away, destroy, or dishonour the images of Our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of His Mother, the immaculate and glorious Virgin Mary, or of the Saints, he shall be excluded from the body and blood of Our Lord and the unity of the

[1] *Cf.* ep. ad Anton. episc. Grad., ap. Mansi, xii. p. 299; and *Chron. Gradense*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, vii.; where we read of Antoninus, patriarch of Grado, and John Archbp. of Ravenna, being summoned to the council.

[2] "Si quis . . . . adversus eandem venerationem sacrarum imaginum, videlicet Dei et Dom. nost. J. Christi, et Genitricis ejus semper virginis immaculatæ, atque gloriosæ Mariæ . . . . et omnium sanctorum depositor . . . . et prophanator extiterit, sit extorris a Corpore et Sanguine D. N. J. Christi vel totius Ecclesiæ unitate." *L. P.*, from which all this paragraph is taken.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Church." Another letter was sent to Leo by the *Defensor* Constantine; and deputies from different parts of Italy were also despatched with letters to the emperor praying for the restoration of holy images. All these messengers shared the same fate. They were all detained in Sicily, then robbed of their letters and sent back loaded with injuries. The Pope even made a fourth attempt to get letters to the emperors (for Constantine Copronymus was now a partner in the imperial throne with his father) and to the 'intruder' in the patriarchal throne, Anastasius.

Violence of Leo, 732.

To these appeals on the part of the Pope to moral force, Leo had recourse to the tyrant's assistant, brute force. He determined to punish the Pope and his refractory subjects (?) in Italy directly and indirectly. About the year 732, a fleet was despatched to Italy to enforce the imperial will. It was shipwrecked in the Adriatic. The taxes of the people of Calabria and Sicily, over whom the emperor still had power, were considerably increased; the 'patrimonies' of the See of Rome in those parts, which yielded 3½ talents of gold (about 350 lbs.[1] of gold, or about £16,000) were confiscated to the imperial exchequer; and the churches[2] of those countries as well as those of the

[1] *Cf. The Power of the Pope*, i. p. 118.

[2] Theoph., in *Chron.*, ad an. 724, is our authority for this paragraph. The authorities for the change of diocese are (1) the famous letter of Hadrian to Charlemagne, on the subject of the worship of images, which is printed at the end of the Seventh General Council (ap. Mansi, xiii. 759, beginning with 'Dominus ac Redemptor'). At the end of this long letter, or rather treatise, Hadrian says he has written about the restitution of the diocese of Illyricum, "quæ tunc cum patrimoniis nostris abstulerunt, quando sacras imagines deposuerunt"; and (2) the close of the first letter ('Principatum itaque,' ap. Mansi, xv. 162 f.) of Pope Nicholas to the emperor Michael. There Nicholas asks that his authority be restored over the places mentioned in the text; and he prays further: "Præterea Calabritanum patrimonium et Siculum, quæque nostræ Ecclesiæ concessa fuerunt, et ea possidenda obtinuit, et disponendo per familiares suos regere studuit, vestris concessionibus

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

great prefecture of Illyricum he transferred to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. This prefecture comprised the Old and New Epirus, Illyricum, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Dacia, Ripensis and Mediterranea, Mœsia, Dardania and Prævalis, with its metropolis Scodra. By this last measure of Leo the patriarchate of Constantinople became coterminous with the limits of the Eastern Empire, and the foundations of the coming schism between the Eastern and Western Churches were deepened. For the orthodox patriarchs were afterwards unwilling to give up their jurisdiction [1] over the provinces of 'Illyricum,' even though acquired in such a scandalous manner. Professor Bury supposes, not without reason, that these changes were the more easily effected by Leo inasmuch as South Italy had become largely Greek by the number of the orthodox who had fled thither from his persecuting arm. The number of orthodox Greeks, he says, priests, monks and laymen, who escaped from the East to South Italy in the reigns of Leo and Constantine has been set at 50,000. And, of course, Leo did not attempt to enforce his Iconoclastic edicts there.

reddantur." Pope Stephen (II.) III., in a letter (757) to Pippin (ap. Cod. Carol. 11, ed. *M. G. Epp.* iii.,) prays him to bring about the restoration of the Calabrian, etc., patrimony. "Postulamus . . . . ut . . . . ita disponere jubeas de parte Græcorum, ut . . . . Ecclesia . . . . *omnia proprietatis suæ* percipiat." These patrimonies were only recovered by the Roman Church, under Nicholas II. (1059), when the Greeks and Saracens had been expelled from those parts by the Normans. (*Cf.* Brunengo, *Orig. del domin. temp.*, p. 61.)

[1] Even in our own days the schismatical Greeks upbraided the clergy of Constantinople with this usurpation, when the latter urged their jurisdiction over the dioceses of Greece. "That is," as the archimandrite Pharmacides, Professor of Theology at the University of Athens, retorted in a reply he made to the clergy of Constantinople on this pretended jurisdiction, "an heretical emperor took these dioceses from an orthodox Pope to give them to a Patriarch as heretical as himself" (Pharmacides, *Antitomos*, Athens, 1850). *Cf.* Pitzipios, *L'Église Orient.*, *P.* i. p. 12.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Leo's attempts to cut off the Pope's supplies were not so successful in the Duchy of Naples. There Duke Theodore, the successor of Exhilaratus, was known to be well disposed towards the Pope. Accordingly, the emperor sent one of his secretaries, by name Alfanus, to Naples with strict orders to charge Theodore not to render any kind of service to the Pope, but, on the contrary, to hinder the despatch to Gregory of the revenues due to him from property belonging to the Holy See in the Duchy. But to these tyrannical orders Theodore[1] turned a deaf ear, and the papal patrimonies in Naples remained safe. Unfortunately the authority for this action by Duke Theodore rests, it seems, solely on a work edited by Pratilli; and the work in question was one of those productions which Pratilli invented as well as published.

Gregory repairs and beautifies churches.

For a year or two after the events above narrated, Gregory seems to have enjoyed an interval of repose from the vexations of external foes, whether the Lombards or the Iconoclast emperors. He employed the interval in making a practical protest against the conduct of Leo, by showing as much honour to images and relics as the emperor was showing disrespect. The *Book of the Popes* gives us a long list of churches which Gregory built, repaired or beautified. Among his other works, he built a beautiful oratory in St. Peter's, in which he placed a large number of the relics[2] of the saints. This oratory (known later as Sancta Maria in Cancellis) stood where now stands, in St. Peter's, the altar of the Transfiguration. Renewed in 1149 by Eugenius III., it was finally demolished in 1507, when the ground was cleared for the present

[1] *La Cronaca di Napoli*, ap. Pratilli, t. iii. p. 31, cited by Bartolini, p. xlvii.

[2] *L. P.* "In quo recondidit in honorem Salvatoris, Sanctæque ejus Genitricis, reliquias SS. App., vel omnium SS. Martyrum ac Confessorum," etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

stupendous pile of St. Peter's on the Vatican. This oratory is more interesting to us now from the liturgical history connected with it.

In a third synod at Rome, held by the Pope, it was decreed that the monks of the three monasteries, whose duty it was to sing the divine office in St. Peter's, should recite part of the office in this oratory. Proper prayers were also prescribed for the Mass to be said in this oratory, and Gregory even added a few words to the canon of the Mass, only, however, to be used in the Mass said in this oratory;[1] because the canon of the Mass had never been touched from the time of St. Gregory I., and it was thought to be against apostolical tradition to tamper with it. Third synod at Rome, 732.

The acts of this synod, the *newly* prescribed prayers, etc., were by Gregory's order engraved on marble tablets, and placed in the oratory itself.[2] These tablets were transcribed by the celebrated collector of epigraphs, Pietro Sabino, a Roman antiquary of the fifteenth century, on the occasion of their discovery, when, by order of Cardinal Cibo, nephew of Innocent VIII., there was being built in this oratory a shrine for the 'Holy Lance.' Many fragments of these tablets are still in existence in the crypt of the Vatican. That prince of archæologists, De Rossi,[3] with their aid, and that of the transcripts of

[1] The words were: "Quorum solemnitas hodie in conspectu tuæ majestatis celebratur, quorum meritis precibusque concedas." *Cf. L. P.*, and Walfrid Strabo, *De divin. offic.*, c. 22.

[2] "Quam institutionem in eodem oratorio tabulis lapideis conscribere fecit." *L. P.* It was from such tablets that the authors of the *Liber Pontificalis* gathered much of their information.

[3] "Due monument. ined. spettanti a due Conc. Rom. dei s. viii. ed xi.," cited by Bartolini (p. xlix), from whom the above is taken. This document is also given in full by Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 422, 3). The document states in two places that the synod was held in the 15th Indiction, or 732. With this inscription, compare the liturgical service

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Sabino, has perfectly restored the reading of this profoundly interesting memorial of an otherwise unknown synod of Gregory III.

Present of the exarch Eutychius.

Still further to decorate St. Peter's, Gregory made use of a present sent him by the exarch, who, since his reconciliation with Gregory II., remained true to the Holy See. The gift consisted of six beautiful spiral columns of onyx marble, and as Bartolini,[1] whom we are here closely following, observes, Gregory determined so to place them that the very sight of them would serve as a protest against the Iconoclasm of the Greek emperors. In the Greek churches, the 'Holy Place,' or Sanctuary, is separated from the rest of the church by a screen that stretches right across, made of pilasters that support a cornice, on which are placed the candelabra. The spaces between the little pillars are taken up with images of the saints. Hence this partition is known as the 'iconostasis,' or place of the images. Gregory made a similar use of the exarch's present. In front of the already existing columns round the 'confession' of St. Peter, the Pope erected the six onyx marble pillars, and between them placed images of Our Lord, Our Lady, and the saints. A beam, covered with plates of pure silver, rested on the columns, and on it was placed some open ornamental work, in the midst of which appeared lamps of pure silver. From these lamps[2] this architrave was known as the 'lamp-beam' (*trabes lampadaria*). There does not seem any further call to enumerate the 'church work' of Pope Gregory. Suffice it to add that he

appointed by Gregory III. for St. Paul's, *without the walls*, as made known to us by another inscription. Ap. Grisar, *Analecta Rom.*, i. 169.

[1] P. L.

[2] *L. P.* *Cf.* Bartolini, whose account will correct that of Gregorovius. Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 422) notes that in one of his frescoes, in the *Hall of Constantine* in the Vatican, Raphael has depicted this piece of decorative work.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

founded monasteries (in one of which—St. Chrysogonus—the future Pope Stephen (III.) IV. was brought up), and rebuilt the hospice of SS. Sergius and Bacchus,[1] near St. Peter's, and endowed it for the support of the poor for ever; and that he decreed that the wine, candles, etc., to be used at the Mass to be said at the cemeteries on the feast days of their various patron saints were to be taken from the Lateran palace by the 'oblationarius,'[2] viz., the subdeacon or deacon whose business it was to take the 'oblata' (the wine, etc.) for the officiating priest and offer or present them to the archdeacon.

The patriarchs of Grado and Aquileia quarrel again, 731-3.

Besides building and decorating churches, various affairs of importance occupied Gregory's attention during this interval of rest which the Greeks and the Lombards allowed him. At the exhortation, as we have seen, of Gregory II., the bishops and people of Venetia and Istria had elected Antoninus, as successor of Donatus, to the patriarchate of Grado. Gregory III. (?) sent him the pallium, and at the Roman synod of November 731 it was decided that the bishop of Grado should be primate of the whole of Venetia and Istria, and that Serenus of Aquileia must be content with Cormones, where he was then residing.[3] But later on we find Calistus, the successor of Serenus, standing in need of the same rebuke for trespassing on the jurisdiction of the See of Grado that Gregory II. had had to address to Serenus. Callistus[4] had to be called to

[1] "Diaconiam SS. Sergii et Bacchi a fundamentis ampliori fabrica dilatavit. Et concedens omnia, quæ in usum Diaconiæ existunt, statuit perpetuo tempore pro sustentatione pauperum in Diaconiæ ministerio deservire," *ib.*

[2] *L. P.*

[3] Johannis, *Chron. Grad.*, ap. Pertz., *M. G. SS.*, vii. pp. 46–7. *Cf.* Paul., *Hist. Langob.*, vi. 51.

[4] Dand., *Chron.*, ap. Muratori, *R. I. S.*, xii., and Jaffé, 2240 (1725). Some time after this we find that the Pope had to exhort, 'with apostolic vigour,' Antoninus to pay the required visit 'ad limina.' The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

order for trying to obtain possession of certain property in the island of Barbiana that belonged to the See of Grado.

Gregory and England. (1) Egbert of York.

Gregory was also busy with the affairs of the English Church. By the decree of his great namesake, Gregory I., there were to have been two archbishoprics in England, one at York and one at Canterbury; but after St. Paulinus had had to abandon York, there had only been one archbishop in England. Now, however, Egbert, Bishop of York, backed by Ceolwulf, King of Northumbria, a relative of his, claimed metropolitical rights for York. Being a man of considerable energy and determination, as well as learning, and "realising that while it is a mark of pride to seek what is not one's due,[1] it is a sign of listlessness not to look after one's rights," he never rested till he obtained the pallium from the Pope. This, according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, he received in the year 735.

(2) Tatwine and Nothelm of Canterbury receive the pall.

To two archbishops of Canterbury is it recorded that Gregory III. gave the pallium. Tatwine, elected archbishop in 731, went to Rome to ask for the pall. The Pope, as we learn from his own letter[2] to the bishops of

archbishop was constantly pleading that political disturbances were always arising that made it unsafe for him to go to Rome. Consequently Gregory had to fix a definite time for him to come. *Cf.* Jaffé, 2256, quoting a document brought to light by Pertz, and printed also *M. G. Epp.*, iii. p. 708.

[1] "Animosioris ingenii cogitans quod sicut superbum est si appetas indebita, ita ignavum si debita negligas." Will. Malms., *De Gest. Reg.*, l. i., ed. Migne, p. 1019; Malms. repeats the same, *De Gest. Pont.*, l. iii., *ib.*, p. 1571. *Cf. Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 735; Lingard, *A.-S. Church*, i. p. 72.

[2] Ap. Malms., *De Gest. Pont.*, i., ed. Migne, p. 1469. "Virum religionis et magnæ probitatis, sub ipso tempore, quo apud nos stetit, eum cognovimus. Proinde auditis ejus petitionibus antecessorum ejus jura dignitatis perquiri in sacro scrinio fecimus, et invenientes eum justa postulasse, sacrum pallium . . . . apostolica auctoritate ei tradidimus." . . . . "Cui vices nostras per omnia gerendas in regione illa commisimus." *Cf. sup.*, Pt. I., pp. 272, 298, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

England, pleased with the character of the man, still took good care to look up the rights of the See of Canterbury before conferring the pall. Finding that Tatwine was only asking for his dues, the Pope gave him the pall and all the privileges that St. Gregory I. had given to St. Augustine, subjecting to him all the bishops of Britain, and making him his vicar. On the death of Tatwine, "this year[1] (736) archbishop Nothelm received his pall from the bishop of the Romans."

(3) St. Boniface.

Transition from the affairs of England to Boniface, the greatest Englishman of his age, is easy. We left him[2] in the receipt of the solution of various difficulties about which he had consulted St. Gregory II. With the most marked success he continued his labours in Hesse and Thuringia. Thousands were baptised. And again, about the year 732, messengers from Boniface appeared in Rome to inform the Pope of the progress of the Church in Germany. After telling Gregory of the kindly relations that existed between his predecessor and their master, they proceeded, in accordance with their instructions, to declare that Boniface wished to profess his humble subjection to the Holy See for the time to come, and to beg that he might be allowed to remain on the same intimate terms with Gregory III. as he had with his namesake.[3] To these requests the Pope returned a most gracious consent both by word of mouth and by letter[4]; and sent

[1] *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 736. Archbishop Cuthbert received the pall in 740 (Rog. Wend., i. 227).

[2] *Sup.*, p. 162.

[3] All this from Willibald's *Life*, c. 6, p. 35. "Sed et devotam ejus in futurum humilitatis apostolicæ sedi subjectionem narraverunt et, ut familiaritati ac communioni sancti pontificis atque totius sedis apostolicæ ex hoc devote subjectus communicaret, quemadmodum edocti erant, precabantur."

[4] *M. G. Epp.*, iii., and *Bib. Rer. Germ.*, iii. p. 91, ep. 28. In this letter Gregory solves difficulties proposed by Boniface, and, among

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his messengers back to St. Boniface with the archiepiscopal pallium and with various presents and relics.

St. Boniface pays a third visit to Rome, about 737.

Cheered by the Pope's encouraging words, 'the German exile,' Boniface,[1] continued his glorious work, again labouring in Bavaria. Once more to enjoy 'the life-giving conversation'[2] of the apostolic Father, and as he felt old age creeping on, to commend himself to the prayers of the saints, Boniface, with a numerous company of his disciples, went (*c.* 737) to Rome for the third time. He was not only most kindly received by the Pope,[3] but during a stay at Rome of over a year, not only the Romans flocked to hear him, but pilgrims of various nations, Anglo-Saxons, Bavarians, etc. What, among other things, helped to keep him so long at Rome was his having to wait for a synod which the Pope was about to hold, as Boniface himself informs us.[4] Whether the said synod was ever held we know not, for it could not have been the third synod of which we have just spoken.[5] However that may be, Boniface returned to his work, loaded as before with presents and relics. This time he made straight (739) for Bavaria, bearing with him various commendatory letters. One[6] commends Boniface to all the bishops and principal ecclesiastics of Germany, urging them to give him what helpers they could. A second[7] was addressed by the Pope to the nobles and peoples

other things, commands him not to tolerate for the future the eating of horse flesh, whether of the 'wild or domestic' animal.

[1] The abbess Eadburga, "exulem Germanicum spiritali lumine consolata est," ep. 30.

[2] "Romam venit, ut apostolici patris salubri frueretur conloquio, et sanctorum se, jam ætate provectus, orationibus commendaret." Willib., *Vita*, c. 7.

[3] *Ib.* *Cf.* Ep. 41 Bonif., ed. *M. G. H.*; or ep. 34, ed. *Bib. Rer. Germ.*

[4] Ep., *l.c.* Dated in Gundlach's and in Jaffé's edd., *c.* 737–8.

[5] *Sup.*, p. 209.

[6] Ep. 42, *M. G. H.*; 127 ed. S.

[7] Ep. 43, *M. G. H.*; 128 S. *Cf. Conversion of the Teutonic Race*, ii. p. 127.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of all Germany, to the Thuringians, Hessians, Borthari (a people on the Bordaa or Wohra), Nistresi (a people on the Nister, a branch of the Sieg), Wedrecii (a people on the Wetter), etc., and was an exhortation to them to obey Boniface, to eschew all manner of sorcery and witchcraft, and to serve God. Finally[1] the bishops in Alemannia and Bavaria were reminded that for the good of the people they ought to receive and listen to Boniface, as his (the Pope's) vicar, renounce all paganism and heresy, and assemble in council twice a year—by the Danube, at Augsburg, or wherever Boniface may appoint the required synods to be held. With the co-operation of Odilo, the reigning duke, Boniface set vigorously to work to consolidate Christianity in Bavaria. False bishops and priests had to be disposed of —as well those who had been invalidly ordained as those who were untrue to their sacred character—and a new hierarchy established. To this end he (739) divided[2] Bavaria into four provinces, placing a bishop over each. In a letter[3] dated IV. Kal. Novemb., 8th indiction (October 29, 739), Boniface received a letter from the Pope congratulating him on the thousands of men that, with the help of Charles Martel (whom Gregory calls 'Prince of the Franks'), he had brought into the fold of Christ; approves of what he has arranged in Bavaria; exhorts him to go on teaching them "the holy Catholic and Apostolic tradition of the Roman Church," orders the reordination of those doubtfully ordained, bids him hold in his (the Pope's) stead a synod by the banks of the Danube, and rather go about from place to place than remain in one spot. For the present we will leave Boniface toiling for

[1] Ep. 44, *M. G. H.*; 129 ed. S. "Nostram agentem vicem" . . . . "apostolica auctoritate a nobis destinatus est."

[2] Will., *Vit.*, c. 7.

[3] Ep. 450, *M. G. H.*; 130 ed. S.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his heavenly Master in Bavaria, which he did not leave to return to Hesse and Thuringia till the end of the year 740.

Gregory repairs the walls of Rome.

We must now turn again to the 'eternal Lombard question' which troubled the last years of Gregory's life. Conscious that the ambition of Liutprand was not dead but sleeping, Gregory completed, at his own cost,[1] the restoration of the walls of Rome, taken in hand by his predecessors. He also renewed in a very strong manner the fortifications of Centumcellæ (Civita Vecchia). For a price, Gregory recovered from Transamund (or Trasimund), Duke of Spoleto, Gallese, a strong place on the Flaminian Way, which the Lombards had seized, and which the Romans had never ceased trying to retake, for it commanded their road of communication with Ravenna. "It is clear that[2] he (the Pope) behaved as ruler in the Roman duchy."

Liutprand in arms against the Duchy of Rome, 739.

Returned, flushed with victory, into Italy from Provence, whither, at the urgent call of Charles Martel, he had gone (737) to help that prince against the Saracens,[3] Liutprand again took up his ambitious views for the subjugation of the whole of Italy. Incursions were at once (Spring 739) made into whatever remnant of the exarchate[4] still remained in the power of the exarch; and the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum were called upon to ravage the Duchy of Rome. This they refused to do, giving as their reason "that they had[5] a treaty with the Roman

[1] *L. P.*

[2] Gregorovius, *Hist. of Rome*, ii. p. 246.

[3] Various chronicles, *Ann. Lambacences* (ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i.), etc., mention this campaign: "Carlus bellum habuit contra Sarracenos," ad an. 737.

[4] Ep. 2 (ed. Gundlach), Greg. III. of the *Codex Carolinus*, where Gregory complains of the wholesale destruction of church property (in 739) by the Lombards in the Ravennese district.

[5] *Ib.* "Dicentes ipsi duces, quia contra Ecclesiam sanctam Dei, ejusque populum *peculiarem* non exercitamus, quoniam et pactum cum eis habemus, et ex ipsa Ecclesia fidem accepimus."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

people and had received their faith from the Roman Church." This action on the part of the dukes gave occasion to Paul the Deacon[1] to write that Transamund of Spoleto rebelled against Liutprand, and has given, we may presume, what ground they have to certain moderns of accusing Gregory of unfair intrigues with the Lombard dukes. But if the treaty (*pactum*) spoken of above were a league—even offensive and defensive—between Gregory and the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum, the Pope is not to be blamed. He had a perfect right to try and strengthen himself against the ambitious Liutprand. No doubt the Lombard dukes had other motives for their action than those which they put forth. Likely enough they threw in their lot with the Pope to get support against Liutprand, whom they were as little anxious to have too powerful as the Pope himself. But we may be sure that Gregory's version of the affair is the true one, viz., that Liutprand did not take up arms to quell a rebellion of insurgent dukes aided by the Pope, but that the dukes were attacked because they refused to carry out the instructions of their king. The resistance of the dukes was passive, not active. Had not this been the truth of the matter, Gregory would not with such confidence have declared that the stories told to Charles against the dukes were untrue, and have begged him to send an incorruptible *missus* to enquire into the whole case.[2] However all this may be, Liutprand

[1] *H. L.*, vi. 55.

[2] "Omnia enim false tibi suggerunt (the Kings, Liutprand and his nephew Hildeprand) . . . . quod quasi aliquam culpam commissam habeant eis eorum duces. . . . Nam ipsi . . . . parati fuerunt et sunt secundum antiquam consuetudinem eis hobedire. . . . Tamen ut rei veritas vobis declaretur . . . . jubeas . . . . tuum fidelissimum missum, qui non premiis corrumpatur, dirigere ut . . . . tue bonitati omnia pandantur." Ep. 2.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was soon on the march for Spoleto. Transamund fled to Rome, and was kindly received by the Pope.[1]

Gregory appeals to Charles Martel, 739.

Nothing could stop the march of the warlike Liutprand. By June 739 Spoleto was in his hands, and one of his followers was named duke in place of Transamund. His troops were soon in the territory of the Romans. Not knowing which way to turn for help in this emergency, Gregory followed[2] the example of his predecessor and appealed to Charles Martel for help. The embassy, which he despatched to the powerful Frankish Major-domo, and of which the chief members were Anastasius, a bishop, and Sergius, a priest, to avoid falling into the hands of the Lombards, went by sea. They were the bearers of a letter, which has perished, many presents, and the keys of the 'confession' of St. Peter. Acting in concert with the Pope were the Roman nobility (*principes Romanorum*), whose resolutions (*decreta*), to the effect that they wished to place themselves under the protection of Charles, and give up all dependence on the emperor, were also taken by the ambassadors along with the Pope's letter.[3] The embassy was received with

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Zach.

[2] *L. P.* in vit. Steph. (II.) III.

[3] The names of the legates, etc., are found in the *L. P.* in vit.; the decrees of the Roman 'princes' are spoken of in the *Chron. Moissiac.*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. SS.*, i., otherwise known as the *Annales Vet. Franc.*, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98; and in the continuator of *Fredegarius*, c. 110 (ap. Bouquet, *Recueil des hist. des Gaules*, ii.), who speaks of the *Romanum consultum*, not *consulatum*, as it appears in some editions by mistake. *Cf.* Jungmann, *Diss.*, xiv. § 25. Apart from his dealings with Charles Martel, the only other *recorded* connection of Gregory III. with Gaul or France (partes Franciæ) is his sending the pall to Vulcarius and making him archbishop of Vienne (*L. P.* in vit. Greg. III.)—a fact evidently unknown to Mr Kellet in his *Pope Gregory the Great and his relations with Gaul* (Cambridge Hist. Essays, No. II.). This writer, in an appendix to the above essay, entitled *A sketch of the relations of the Franks with the Papacy* from 604–800, draws a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

all honour by Charles, and sent back to Rome, we are told,[1] 'with great presents,' but without any promise of assistance. Continued success meanwhile was attending the arms of Liutprand. Four of the border towns of the Roman duchy fell into his hands—Ameria (Amelia), Ortas (Orte), Polimartium (Bomarzo), and Blera (Bieda)[2]—and his tents and standards were to be seen from the walls of Rome dotted over the Neronian plain. Once more was the unhappy Campagna laid waste, and, as a mark of their dependence, many Roman nobles were forced to wear their hair and dress in the Lombard fashion.[3] In despair the Pope sent again for help to Charles. For Transamund, neither he nor the Romans would give up, and Liutprand was resolved to get him into his hands.[4] "Our affliction," he writes to the *subregulus*, as he called Charles, "moves us to write to you once again, trusting that you are a loving son of St. Peter and of us, and that, from respect for him, you will come and defend the Church of God and His 'peculiar people,' who are now unable to endure the persecution and oppression of the Lombards. They have seized the very means set aside to furnish funds for the lights ever kept burning

number of most erroneous conclusions, not only from non-existing documents, but also from his own want of knowledge.

[1] Ann. Moissiac., *ib.*

[2] "Ab eodem rege (Liutprand) abstulte sunt a ducatu Romano civitates IIII. . . . et sic isdem rex ad suum palatium est reversus per mensem augustum," indictione vii. *L. P.* in. vit. Zach., § 207. So in his letter of Oct. 15, 740, to the bishops of Tuscany (ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 478 n.), Gregory speaks of the four towns "quæ *anno præterito* b. Petro ablata sunt."

[3] *L. P.* For this Lombard method of wearing the hair, etc., *cf.* Paulus, *H. L.*, iv. 22; Hodgkin, *Italy*, v. 154.

[4] "Dum a prædecessore ejus (Pope Zachary) b. memoriæ Gregorio, atque ab Stephano quodam patricio et duce, vel omni exercitu Romano prædictus Trasimundus redditus non fuisset." . . . *L. P.* in vit. Zach., § 207.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

at St. Peter's tomb, and they have carried off offerings that have been made by you and by those who have gone before you. And because, after God, we have turned to you, the Lombards deride and oppress us. Hence the Church of St. Peter[1] has been stripped and reduced to the last straits. We have put into the mouth of the bearer of this letter, your faithful servant (*tuus fidelis*), all our woes, which he will be able to unfold to you." In conclusion[2] Gregory begs Charles to come at once, to show his love towards St. Peter, and 'us, his own people' (*ejusque—Petri—peculiarem populum*).

Liutprand withdraws, Aug. 739.

It was perhaps this letter which caused Charles Martel to despatch an embassy to Rome. Certain it is, at any rate, that he sent one. Grimo, abbot of Corbie, and Sigebert, a monk of St. Denis, brought a letter and presents for the Pope.[3] Whether through fear of the Roman fever, or, as there is reason[4] to believe, influenced by the arrival of this deputation, and perhaps by some remonstrance on the part of Charles Martel, who was doubtless to that extent moved by the letters of Gregory, Liutprand withdrew[5] to Pavia in the August of 739. But he was not prepared to forego the goal of his ambition without an effort. He, too, sent an embassy to Charles. The great 'Mayor of the Palace'

[1] From these words, some have erroneously concluded that it was the actual basilica of St. Peter, and not the property of the Roman Church in general that had been devastated.

[2] Ep. 1, ed. G.

[3] Ann. Moissiac. l. c.

[4] The reason is that Charlemagne, in his will, regulating the division of his empire, declared that his grandfather, Charles Martel, had been a *defender* of the Church of St. Peter, just as he had himself. "Super omnia jubemus, ut ipsi tres fratres (Carolus, Pippinus, Ludovicus) curam et defensionem Ecclesiæ S. Petri suscipiant simul, sicut quondam ab avo nostro Carolo et .... Pipino .... et a nobis postea suscepta est" (*Charta de divisione regnorum*, § 15). Ap. Boretius, i. p. 129. *Cf.* Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 741.

[5] *L. P.* in vit. Zach.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was reminded that Liutprand had adopted or taken under his special protection Charles' young son Pippin, and that Liutprand was his brother-in-law. On the other hand, every effort was made to impress upon the Frankish Prince that Liutprand simply wanted to punish rebellious subjects. Whether or not Charles was convinced, the envoys of the Lombard returned rejoicing. The Mayor of the Palace was ill,[1] they said, and would not fight. Again, then (740), did Liutprand take the field; and again was Gregory compelled to write[2] to Charles. "We were overwhelmed with grief when we saw the little that was left from last year for the support of the poor of Christ and the upkeep of the church lamps in the Ravennese district, laid waste with fire and sword by the kings of the Lombards. Moreover, to these parts also have they despatched troops. They have destroyed the farms of St. Peter, and the cattle which still remained to us they have carried off. Not only have we not received any help from you, but, as you have not checked the warlike action of the kings, it is clear that you have paid more attention to their version of the affair than you have to ours, true though it be. The result is that you yourself are even derided by them: 'Let Charles and his Franks come and save you from us if they can.' By the power given him by God, St. Peter could defend his own; but he would try his faithful children." Charles must not believe what the Lombard kings urge against the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum. "Their only offence is that last year (738) they refused to make an inroad on us." . . . "For the dukes were, and are, ready to render them that obedience which ancient custom requires." . . . "Still, that you may know the truth for yourself, send a faithful agent, who

[1] For the last three years of his life Charles Martel was out of health.
[2] Ep. 2, ed. Gund., ann. 740.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cannot be bribed, and let him see what we have to suffer, and then report everything to you." . . . "Prefer not the friendship of these kings to that of the Prince of the Apostles. Make haste to help us." Meanwhile, taking advantage of the withdrawal (739) of the Lombard king, Transamund came to an understanding with the Romans, collected a large army and entered the Duchy of Spoleto in two directions. He was completely victorious, and entered Spoleto, December 739 (or 740 ?). But no sooner was Transamund once more firmly established in his position than he proved unfaithful to his benefactors. In vain Gregory wrote to him "to recover the four[1] cities which had been lost for his sake." Transamund would not move; probably he felt it would take him all his time to prepare to resist Liutprand. Gregory then tried to move Liutprand himself to restore the cities. He sent to him the priest Anastasius and the regionary subdeacon Adeodatus. This we know from a letter[2] which the Pope wrote to the bishops of Lombard Tuscany (October 15, 740), reminding them of their consecration oath, by which they had undertaken to do all they could for the Church of St. Peter when it was in danger, and exhorting them to help and co-operate with his ambassadors, so that the four cities might be restored. "Weak as I am from illness," concludes the brave Pope, "if, as I will not believe, you should refrain from giving your help and going with my ambassadors, I will undertake the journey myself and save you from the responsibility of being unfaithful to your obligations."

Death of Gregory III., 741.

It was all in vain; Liutprand would not listen, but continued his warlike operations against the exarchate

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Zach.

[2] Ep. ap. Migne, t. 98 p. 58, and ap. Gundlach, *M. G. Epp.*, iii. p. 478 n.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and the Roman duchy. The shock of battle was not to be much longer felt by Gregory; but he died[1] whilst its din was ringing in his ears. Gregory was buried in St. Peter's,[2] December 10 (November 29, Jaffé), 741. It is very unfortunate that, for the pontificates of the two Gregorys, while events of paramount importance were taking place there should be such chronological uncertainty. Those who are of opinion that the capture of Ravenna effected by Liutprand did not take place under Gregory II., believe that it occurred at the close of the reign of his successor. If the conjecture of these writers is correct, and if it be further the fact that Transamund recovered possession of Spoleto in December 739, we have perhaps an explanation of how it was that Liutprand had not attacked him again in force before the death of Gregory, at the close of 741. Liutprand would have been too busy with his designs on Ravenna to attend to his enemies further south. But, of course, even without supposing that he seized the imperial capital in Italy at this time, he may have had to devote such attention to the exarch that he had not proper time to devote to punishing the Spoletans. But obviously there is nothing but conjecture in all this.

His character.

After what we have seen of the life of Gregory III., we can have little difficulty in endorsing his character as we find it in the pages of the *Book of the Popes*, and that even though it is almost a word for word repetition of the character of Leo II. "He was a man of the greatest meekness and one truly wise. He was well acquainted

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Zach.

[2] In the oratory to Our Lady, which had been built by him (*cf. sup.*, p. 208). Eugenius III. was buried in the same place, as a verse in his epitaph notes: "Tertius hic papa Gregorius est tumulatus" (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 532). It is on Nov. 28 that Gregory is commemorated in the Roman martyrology.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with the sacred Scriptures, knowing all the Psalms by heart, and thoroughly imbued with their meaning. Skilled both in Latin and Greek, he was a polished and successful preacher, and a stout upholder of the Catholic faith. He was a lover both of poverty and the poor, a protector of the widow and the orphan, and a friend of monks and nuns (*religiose volentibus vivere . . . . dilector*).

Death of Leo III. and Charles Martel.

A few months before the death of Gregory, first the emperor Leo III. (June 18) and then Charles Martel (October 21)[1] had also terminated their turbulent careers. The one was to be followed by a son, Constantine Copronymus, who was to be a fiercer enemy of the Church than his father; the other by a son, Pippin, who was to be to it a greater benefactor.

[1] According to the *Ann. S. Amand.*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i., ad an. 741, Charles died on the 15th of Oct.: "Karlus dux Francorum mortuus est Idibus Oct."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. ZACHARY.

A.D. 741–752.

Sources.—The full and contemporary *Life* in the *L. P.* Letters of Zachary in the *Codex Carolinus*, etc.; extracts from his *Registers*. Various Chronicles, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.* From the extant copies it is clear that the practice of drawing up chronicles or annals began among the Franks at the end of the seventh, or the beginning of the eighth, century, in connection with the greater churches or monasteries. In a short time these annals were circulated through several monasteries. They consist for the most part of short notices, written down by successive unknown but simple scribes. Hence, in the case of contemporary writers, as men who wrote not for others but for themselves, for a friend or for their Church, they may be implicitly relied on. Of course there are errors in the *Annals*, as we *now have them*. This from various reasons, *e.g.*, from mistakes made in recopying originals that were perhaps getting the worse for wear; and from the fact that owing to want of space, events were not assigned to their proper years with sufficient care. Some of these annals were drawn up not by the private enterprise of an individual monk, but under the auspices of the civil authorities—*e.g.*, the *Annales Laurissenses* or *Laureshamenses* (The Annals of Lorsch), from 741–788. The *Annales Bertiniani* in France, and *Fuldenses* in Germany, were continuations of these *public* annals. Though there is not the slightest reason for supposing that all the early annals were derived from a common source, it is more than likely that certain groups of them have a common source, *e.g.*, the Annales S. Amandi, Laubacenses and Tiliani. Many of them are to be found

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. and ii. In xiii. and xiv. this original collection was enlarged and corrected. In i. we have, *e.g.*, the *Chronicon Moissiacense*, a South-Gaulish Chronicle, drawn up at the beginning of the ninth century. These annals have a close affinity, or, rather, are almost identical with the *Annales Veteres Francorum*, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98. The Annals of Lorsch (Laurissenses, otherwise known as Plebeii and Loiseliani) are important. They run from 741–829, are believed to be the work of three different compilers, and are, perhaps, in a wide sense, official annals. Certain annals have, without sufficient reason, been assigned to the famous Eginhard or Einhard, the secretary and biographer of Charlemagne. *Cf.* De Smedt, *Introduc. Gen. ad. H. E.*, pp. 88–96, from whom much of the above note is taken, and especially Monod, *Études critiques sur les sources de l'hist. Caroling.* Paris, 1898. See also *Monks of the West*, vi. pp. 212–215, for the care taken in drawing up these chronicles in the English monasteries that were of royal foundation.

Modern Works.—Di S. Zaccaria Papa, by Cardinal Bartolini (Ratisbon, 1879), a careful and exhaustive work, though the knowledge of the geography of England therein displayed is scarcely to be praised. The freest use has been here made of this work.

Emperor of the East.	Kings of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine V. (Copronymus), 741–775.	Liutprand, 712–744. Hildeprand (alone), 744. Ratchis, 744–749. Aistulf, 749–757.	Eutychius 727–752 (apparently the last of the exarchs).

Zachary Pope, Dec. 10, 741.

ON the very day of the death of Gregory III. (December 10), according to Duchesne, but, according to others, four days after the burial of Pope Gregory, viz., on Sunday, December 3, 741, Zachary, a Greek,[1] the son of Polychronius,

[1] *L. P.* According to Bartolini (p. 3), Zachary was born at Seberena, now St. Severina on the Neto in Calabria, which was part of Magna Græcia, and was still dependent on Constantinople.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was consecrated Bishop of Rome. It need scarcely be pointed out that, from the shortness of the vacancy of the Holy See in this case, there can have been no reference to exarch or emperor in connection with the election and consecration of Zachary. Of the new Pope we are informed, by the *Book of the Popes*, that he was a man of extraordinary suavity—a trait in his character which his success in dealing with his Lombard foes may well incline us to believe—a lover of the clergy and people in Rome,[1] slow to anger, quick to forgive, and never returning evil for evil. On the contrary, returning good for evil, he even, after he became Pope, honoured and enriched those who had opposed him. Although regarding this description of the character of Zachary as a stereotyped 'official eulogium,' Gregorovius[2] allows, "with respect, at least, to the benefits acquired for the Church, the tribute in the case of Zachary to have been well deserved."

The Pope sends legates to Liutprand, 741.

Doubtless one of the principal reasons why the consecration of Zachary took place with such little delay was the critical state of affairs between the Romans and the Lombards. We left Liutprand, angry with both the Romans and the Lombards of Spoleto and Beneventum, preparing to subdue both; and Transamund false to his engagements to help the Romans to recover 'the four cities.' The first thing that the new Pope did was to send an embassy to Liutprand, to beg him to restore the cities. Liutprand promised to do so; and in return

[1] *L. P.* "Pro salute populi Romani suam ponere animam non dubitaret."

[2] II. p. 256. Even by Photius (*Mystagogia*, ap. Migne, *P. G.*, t. cii. p. 367) the 'admirable Zachary' is highly praised for his 'learning and miracles,' and for promulgating throughout the world "by the trumpet of his Greek translation, the writings of St. Gregory I." To Dr. Hodgkin, *Italy*, vii. 97, he is 'an eminent pontiff.'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Pope sent the forces of the duchy to help the king against the faithless Transamund.[1]

Zachary has an interview with Liutprand (742 ?).

But after Transamund had been disposed of (he had been made a cleric), and his 'kingdom given to another,' Liutprand imitated his example and would not move in the matter of restoring the cities.[2] Accordingly Zachary resolved to interview the Lombard king in person. With a number of his clergy in his train, the Pope set out boldly for Interamna (Terni), where Liutprand was then staying. Arrived at Orte, the Pope was met by an envoy of the king, who escorted Zachary to Narni,[3] the key of the valley of the Nera or Nar. On the great Flaminian road, eight miles from Narni, the Pope encountered Liutprand himself, who walked respectfully—*in ejus obsequium*—by Zachary's side, and likewise his nobles and a large number of his troops. The king and the Pope, we are told, prayed and conversed together; and then Zachary urged peace. Liutprand agreed, and gave back 'the said four cities with their *inhabitants*'[3] to the Pope. He also restored (*reconcessit*) the Sabine patrimony, which had been lost for thirty years, and Narni, Osimo, Ancona, Humana, and the valley which is called Great, by the title of donation to Blessed Peter himself, the Prince of the Apostles, concluded a treaty for twenty years with the Roman duchy, and set free the Roman captives in his dominions. Before

[1] *L. P.* For some reason Gregorovius (*ib.*) sees fit to observe, that, by this action of the Pope, Transamund was "unhesitatingly sacrificed to reasons of personal advantage." Why should he not have been 'sacrificed,' seeing that he was himself first false to his agreement with the Pope!

[2] *L. P.*, and Paul., *H. L.*, vi. 56, 7.

[3] On Narni and Terni and their scenery, *cf.* Miley, i. pp. 31–6. "Prædictas quatuor civitates . . . . eidem sancto cum eorum habitatoribus redonavit viro. Quas et per donationem firmavit" (*L. P.*). "Auximanum, etc., per donationis titulum ipsi b. Petro App. Principi, reconcessit" (*ib.*). The 'four cities' were Ameria, Horta, Polimartium and Blera.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

leaving the king, Zachary, at his request, consecrated a new bishop for Terni (?),[1] as some maintain. On the Sunday the two dined together, and so merry was the meal, that Liutprand declared that he had never had such a glorious dinner before. The next day the Pope set out for Rome, taking possession, *en route*, of the four cities, which officers of Liutprand, who escorted the Pope, caused to be handed over to him. Zachary entered Rome in triumph; and to thank God for His mercies, ordered a solemn procession from the Church of Our Lady 'ad Martyres' (the Pantheon) to St. Peter's[2] (741 or the beginning of 742).

Zachary a sovereign.

Into all this affair it is the personal element only which enters. We have on the one hand the commanding personal influence of Zachary, and on the other a Lombard king moved to acts, if not of generosity, at least of justice, by considerations of which the Pope was the sole centre. Liutprand had no respect for the Iconoclast emperor at Constantinople, and the only thought he gave to that emperor's Italian dominions was to consider how he himself might best obtain possession of them. Hence what was his by the right of the spear he gave up, not to the emperor, who with his image-breaking propensities was quite at a discount with all parties in the Italian peninsula, but to the Pope personally. Pope Zachary was practically a king by consent of Liutprand. In all these transactions there is no mention of either emperor or Roman Republic. Liutprand and Zachary are the only parties concerned. As far as the former was concerned, the rule of the Byzantine in Italy was at an

[1] The text of the *L. P.* has "in locum Cosinensis." Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 337) can see no reason for giving this as Terni. He thinks that the text is corrupt, and suggesting that the initial 'Co' might have come from locum or loco, adroitly conjectures that the place may be Sienna, which was, moreover, in Lombard Tuscany.

[2] All straightforward in the *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

end. And had it not been for Pope Zachary, there is no doubt that Liutprand the Lombard, like Theoderic the Goth, would have ruled in Rome and Ravenna!

Liutprand advances against Ravenna, 744.

Zachary had not yet finished with the Lombards. In 743 Liutprand began to make preparations for the final reduction of Ravenna. Convinced of their powerlessness to resist the old Lombard warrior, the exarch, the archbishop of Ravenna (John), and the people sent to entreat the Pope to hasten to their aid. As the embassy[1] that Zachary at once sent off with presents to Liutprand failed in its object, the Pope himself, after entrusting the government[2] of the city to the Duke Stephen, "like a true shepherd hurried off to save the sheep who were in danger of perishing."[3] Whilst on their journey to Ravenna, the Pope and his companions were, it is said, in answer, as we are assured, to their fervent prayers to St. Peter, protected every day from the heat of the sun by a cloud,[4] which disappeared every evening. The Pope was met by the exarch at the Church of St. Christopher, at a place—not now known—called 'ad Aquila,' about fifty miles from Ravenna. When Zachary

[1] One of the ambassadors was Bishop Benedict, 'Vicedominus' or Prefect of the Lateran Palace. That he was bishop of Nomentum appears from his signature at the Roman Council of 745. (*Cf.* Bartolini, 76.)

[2] "Relicta Romana urbe Stephano Duci ad gubernandum," *ib.* After phrases such as these, there cannot be a doubt as to who was the 'Lord and Master' of Rome.

[3] *Ib.*

[4] *L. P.* In at least one of the editions of the *Liber Pontificalis* this miracle of the cloud does not appear. In fact, Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. introd. p. ccxxiv) shows that the incident has been interpolated into the MSS. of the first edition of Zachary's biography. The interpolation is, however, of a very early date, apparently before the year 774. At this period partial biographies of the popes were, sometimes at least, in circulation during their lifetime (Duchesne, *ib.* ccxxii), so that, in this case, as the first notices of Zachary were probably drawn up by one who accompanied the Pope to Ravenna, the absence of the story of the cloud in the first edition is probably fatal to its truth.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

drew near the city, all the inhabitants poured forth to welcome him, crying out with tears in their eyes, "Welcome to our Shepherd, who has left his own sheep and come to save us who are on the point of perishing."

The Pope proceeds to Pavia, 743.

The first thing the Pope did on his arrival at Ravenna was to despatch messengers to the Lombard king to announce his coming. When they reached the Lombard borders at Imola, they found that orders had been given not to allow the Pope to pass. During the night they contrived that notice of this should be sent to the Pope. So far from being daunted by this news, Zachary left Ravenna (Saturday, June 22, 743), and, soon striking the straight Æmilian Way,[1] he reached Placentia, June 28. Here he was met by many of the Lombard nobility, who had been sent by Liutprand to receive the Pope, though he had refused to see Zachary's messengers. Thus escorted, the Pope pushed on to Pavia, which he entered the same day, after having said Mass at three o'clock in the afternoon[2] (as was usual on fast days) in the Church of St. Peter, outside the walls. On the Monday (June 30), after a great deal of opposition (*duritia*), Zachary carried his point; and Liutprand agreed to give up the parts around Ravenna that were in his hands, and two-thirds of the district of Cesena. The remaining part, and Cesena itself, he was to keep in pledge till June 1, 744, by which time his ambassadors would have returned from Constantinople, whither, as Bartolini thinks,[3] they were sent by Liutprand to have this treaty of peace ratified.

When the Pope left Pavia, Liutprand sent a number of his nobles with him, to see that the recently conquered

[1] Near Placentia (Piacenza) the Via Æmilia crosses the Po.

[2] "Ad horam orationis nonam pro vigiliarum b. Petri celebrandis solemniis missarum," etc.

[3] P. 79.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

territory should be restored to its owners. Zachary, on his return[1] to Rome, 'with all the people,' sung a Mass of thanksgiving for the success of his enterprise, begging of God to save the people of Ravenna and Rome from any further oppression on the part of the persecuting intriguer Liutprand. "His prayers," adds his biographer, "were heard by the divine clemency," for Liutprand died in January 744. Further, "there was joy" not only among the Ravennese and Romans, but even among the Lombards themselves, when Hildeprand, Liutprand's nephew (who had been associated with him in the kingdom in 735), who was evilly disposed (*malevolus*) to them, was expelled the kingdom, and Ratchis (Duke of Friuli) was chosen in his stead."[2] To

Death of Liutprand and accession of Ratchis, 744.

[1] Perhaps in time to celebrate the octave of SS. Peter and Paul, "Denuo natale B. Petri et Pauli . . . . celebravit." *L. P.* Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 437) thinks it is the feast of St. Peter's Chains (Aug. 1) that is here referred to. In connection with this, Duchesne has an interesting note which we will reproduce. In an *Ordo Romanus* (MS. Vat. Reg. 1127 of the ninth century), not yet edited, it appears that after the Pope and his assistants had removed their sacred vestments in the sacristy, the *ministers*, as they do to this day after episcopal masses, asked his blessing. Before leaving for their homes, they drank three glasses of wine—et accepta benedictione de manu ipsius, confirmant ternos calices. The wine which is passed round at the end of Mass when ordinations have been held is, Duchesne believes, connected with the rite just mentioned. Whilst the Pope and clergy were drinking this wine at Easter time—which they then did with special solemnity after Vespers—the *Schola cantorum* sang a Greek hymn, Πάσχα ἱερόν.

[2] *L. P.* Dr. Hodgkin (vi. 498) regrets "the song of triumph which the papal biographer raises over the death of the intriguer and persecutor Liutprand." But, first, it is to be noted that the 'song of triumph' is over the expulsion of Hildeprand; and, secondly, if it were not, surely his death must have been felt as an immense relief by the Romans and Ravennese. How can a man be regarded as a friend who is always attacking you or yours, even if by one effort and another you succeed in diverting his assaults, or even in wringing concessions from him? History plainly shows that such were the relations between Liutprand and those not under his jurisdiction. And who finds it hard to forgive a man who rejoices over the death of an enemy of his country?

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the new king the Pope sent an embassy at once, and, "out of reverence for the Prince of the Apostles," he granted a peace for twenty years—a peace which wellnigh cost Ratchis dear. It caused many of the Lombard nobles to ally themselves with Aistulf, his brother, with a view of his seizing the reins of government.[1] It is not, therefore, matter for surprise that, with such a warlike spirit rife among the chief men in his kingdom, Ratchis was driven, willy-nilly, into breaking the peace he had made. In the year 749, doubtless in the spring, his armies both poured into the Pentapolis and invested Perugia. Without any delay, the Pope, taking with him a few of the clergy and nobility, hastened to Perugia, again determined to try the effect of his personal influence. And again was he successful. His presents[2] and eloquent entreaties so prevailed on Ratchis that he drew off his armies. Like St. Leo I., twice had he saved Rome from the barbarian. Nor did the effect of his eloquence end there. Soon afterwards Ratchis resigned his crown, and from the Pope's own hand received, along with his wife and daughter, the monastic habit,[3] following the example of Carloman. As we might have expected, his fierce brother Aistulf was elected in his stead, June 749.[4]

Ratchis in arms against the exarch and Pope, 749.

Ratchis exchanges a crown for a cowl, 749.

[1] *L. P.*, and the *Chronicle* of Benedict, a monk of St. Andrew's (before the end of tenth century), ad an. 744, Sept. "Propter hoc" (the concession of the treaty of peace), says Benedict (ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, iii. p. 702), "Langobardi irritati adversus Rachisi rex (*sic*), et tractantes cum Astulphus (!) de regno ejus." Pertz notes that this information has been drawn by Benedict from the Annals of Laureshеim, a most trustworthy source (Bartolini, p. 220 f.).

[2] "Impensisque eidem Regi plurimis muneribus"—the Popes were ever pouring forth of their treasure—"atque . . . . eum deprecans, ... ab obsessione ipsius civitatis eum amovit." *L. P. Cf. Chron. Casenensis*, ap. *M. G. SS. Lang.*, p. 487.

[3] *L. P.*, and *Chron. Cas.*

[4] Benedict of Soracte, *Chron.*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, iii. "Coronatus est hisdem Astulfus in Mediolana hurbem, infra Ecclesiam S. Ambrosii,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

St. Boniface writes to congratulate Zachary on his election, 742.

To retain, as far as consistent with clearness, the chronological order of events, and because Zachary's dealings with Boniface are as important as any of the events of his pontificate, we may here with advantage take up the thread of the history of St. Boniface,[1] 'the envoy (*missus*) of St. Peter,' as he is called in a capitulary of Carloman. As soon as he heard of the accession of Zachary, Boniface wrote[2] at once to express to him his great pleasure at his (Zachary's) election, and to assure him that he hoped to be as obedient a servant of his (Zachary's) as he had been of his predecessors, and to bring all his converts to the same obedience. He then went on to ask the Pope to confirm the three bishoprics of Wurtzburg, Buraburg and Erfurt, which he had established in Germany, to the end that "present or future generations might not presume to interfere with these dioceses or violate the commands of the Apostolic See."

Zachary is then informed that Carloman,[3] duke of the Franks, wanted Boniface to hold a synod in that part of the kingdom of the Franks which was under his

et electus est Rex in mense Junius Indictione ii.," or x., as by mistake it reads in the *Chronicle*. *Aitches* seem to be the only thing that bother Benedict! (Bartolini, p. 391.)

[1] *Cf. sup.* 213.

[2] Ep. 132, ed. *S.*; Ep. 50, *Düm.*, p. (3), ap. Bartolini; his Italian translation occurs, p. 23 *seq.* "Optantes catholicam fidem et unitatem Romanæ Ecclesiæ servare, et . . . . discipulos . . . . ad obedientiam apostolicæ sedis invitare et inclinare non cesso." This letter is very fully analysed in English, *Conversion of the Teutonic Race*, ii. p. 146.

[3] On the death of Charles Martel, his two sons shared his power between them. Carloman held sway in Austrasia, the German portion of the Frankish kingdom; and Pippin in Neustria, the Gallic portion. Boniface acknowledges his great dependence on the 'Prince of the Franks'—"Sine patrocinio principis Francorum æcclesiæ regere . . . . non possum, nec ipsos paganorum ritus . . . . prohibere valeo." Ep. 60 *D.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

control, and had promised to do all in his power to reform ecclesiastical discipline, which for some sixty or seventy years had been neglected. To carry out his design, Carloman was anxious for the sanction of the apostolic authority. "As the older men declare, it is more than eighty years ago since the Franks held a synod, had an archbishop, or made or renewed laws for any church. Most of the sees[1] have been handed over to laymen eager for gain, or to immoral clerics to enjoy in a worldly way. If I am to carry out the duke's wishes, I desire to have behind me the power of the Apostolic See." Boniface next asked the Pope what steps he should take against immoral bishops, or against such as were given to drink, hunting, or fighting in battle.

In accordance with permission granted by Gregory III., as Zachary knows, inasmuch as the permission was given in his presence, Boniface had elected a successor. Now, however, he wishes to get leave to choose another, as a feud had sprung up between the one first elected and the Prince.

Boniface has to complain of various abuses which, under pretence of permission from the apostolic See, or of doing as they do in Rome, certain people wish to practise in Germany. For instance, certain stupid Bavarians and Franks think that they can practise all sorts of pagan superstitions, because in Rome, under the very eyes of the Pope, they have seen or heard, on the first of January,[2] choruses singing pagan and sacrilegious

[1] "Maxima ex parte .... episcopales sedes traditæ sunt laicis cupidis ad possidendum, vel adulteratis clericis, scortatoribus, et publicanis sæculariter ad perfruendum" (*ib.*). This state of things was due both to the general civil disorder caused by intestine wars and by the inroads of the Saracens; and to the action of Charles Martel, who rewarded his veterans with the property and offices of the Church. The sword severs all bonds, ecclesiastical as well as civil.

[2] We find that in the Council of Tours (567), c. 23, the assembled bishops condemned those who honoured Janus on the 1st of January;

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

songs through the streets, pagan feasts, women binding their arms and legs in pagan fashion with amulets, and offering the same for sale, and other heathen rites. The Pope is urged to stop these customs.

Immoral bishops who have returned from Rome, saying that they have obtained permission to celebrate, Boniface has resisted, because he has never heard that the apostolic See has given decisions against the canons. To show his devotion to the Pope, he sends him, as a present, a little gold and silver and a hairy towel for the feet, (*villosam unam*)—an article we find that Boniface was very fond of sending to his friends.

Reply of Zachary to Boniface, 742 (?).

To this, to us most interesting letter, Zachary returned an answer[1] (April 1, 742 ?) such as might have been expected. He approves of the erection of the three sees, says he has sent 'letters of confirmation' to each of the three candidates, permits Boniface to be present at the synod, and, by virtue of the apostolic authority, exhorts him on no account to allow unworthy bishops to perform the functions of the episcopal office. The Pope, however, forbids Boniface to appoint his successor during his life-

and there are extant many denunciations of the Fathers against those who continued to observe the pagan practices of the 1st January. According to the mythology of the Romans, Janus presided over the beginnings of everything, and therefore, of course, over the beginning of the new year, which with them, as with us, began in January. The presents (strenæ) that people gave to one another on that day were so called from the goddess Strenia, or Strenua, who was credited with being able to make men strong—strenuous. The word survives in the French 'étrenne.' (*Cf.* Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, i., note to the feast of the 'Circumcision'; Smith's *Classical Dict.* in voce *Janus*, etc.). Clearly the only practical way to deal with long-established popular customs, if a change is desirable, is to alter their end or object. An attempt to abolish them peremptorily will scarcely succeed. Canons 61 and 62 of the Quinisext Council (692) show that similar abuses existed at Constantinople and the East at different times of the year.

[1] Ep. 142, ed. *S.*; 51, ed. *Düm.* The chronological data at the end of this letter give 743 as the time of its despatch.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

time, as such a proceeding is wholly against the canons; but, as a great personal favour, the Pope will ordain the one whom, on his death-bed, in the presence of all, Boniface may designate as his successor.

Zachary next assures Boniface that he has put an end to all pagan customs on the 1st of January, and that his predecessor and father[1] had also issued a decree against them. After approving of the action of Boniface in the matter of those immoral bishops who had, of course, falsely pretended to have been granted indulgence at Rome, Zachary concludes by telling the archbishop to refer to him what difficulties he cannot settle by the canons, and assuring him that he (the Pope) has such love for him that he would be glad to have him ever by his side.

The first national synod in Germany, 742.

The holding of a synod was part of a scheme of reform inaugurated by Boniface[2] for the whole Frankish kingdom, which both Carloman and Pippin, who ruled respectively over Austrasia and Neustria, were eager to carry out. The wholesale decay of morals, which years of internal and external wars had engendered, and which the reckless confiscation of Church property and the barefaced bestowal of ecclesiastical offices on his soldiers indulged in by Charles Martel had greatly increased, called for immediate attention. Accordingly a synod, in which all the ecclesiastics in Carloman's[3] realm were present,

[1] "Nutritoris nostri," *ib.* In the 'letters of confirmation' which Zachary sent to Witta of Buraburg, and Burchard of Wurtzburg on the same day (Epp. 52, 53, ed. *D.*), he forbids, by the authority of Blessed Peter, anyone to interfere with their rights and their interfering with one another's rights.

[2] "Cum Charlomanni et Pippini roboratum est imperium, tunc . . . . suggerente S. Bonifatio archiepiscopo, relegionis christianæ confirmatum est testamentum, et orthodoxorum patrum synodalia sunt in Francis correcta instituta," etc. *Vit. S. Bonif.*, c. 7.

[3] *Ib.*, c. 8.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was held under the presidency of Boniface, as legate of the Pope. The place at which this synod met is not known for certain. It was held[1] April 21, 742.

Carloman, who was present at the synod along with many of his nobles, gave to its decrees the force of public law. These decrees provided for the holding of synods every year, and for the punishment of bad priests, forbade clerics to wear the dress of laymen, or fight on the field of battle, and ordered priests to obey their bishops.

The synod of Liftinæ, Mar. 1, 743.

In accordance with the decree of this synod of 742, relative to the annual holding of synods, there was assembled at Liftinæ (often on inferior authority called Liptinæ) again, in the dominion of Carloman, a second synod, March 1, 743.[2] From the fragments of the acts that have come down to us, we see that the first thing done was that the bishops, counts and prefects[3] confirmed the acts of the previous synod and promised to stand by them. Various other decrees were passed to regulate the morals

[1] *Cf.* Héfélé, *Hist. des Conc.*, iv. p. 397 f., French trans.; Bartolini, p. 47 f. and (10); Ep. 78, ed. *S.*; *D.* 56.

[2] Again we are involved in chronological difficulties. Some refer this synod to the year 745. However, as the letter of Zachary, next to be quoted, which is generally allowed to refer to this synod, is dated in the reign of Artavasdus, and as he had certainly ceased to reign by the end of 743, we may well prefer the date 743. It is much easier for copyists or others to make mistakes in the number of the indiction, or in the dates of the emperor's years, than in his name. Liftinæ is not the modern Belgian village of Lessines; but the site of the royal villa of that name is near the village of Binche, in the same province of Hainault. On this synod, *cf.* Héfélé, iv. p. 402 (French trans.); Bartolini, p. 69 f. and (12) f. Héfélé might well have sighed for another edition of St. Boniface's letters. There was but little hope of avoiding chronological confusion in their use, as edited by Serarius or Würdtwein. Jaffé's later ed. (*Bib. Rer. Germ.*, iii.) is rather better. But even Dümmler, their latest editor, despairs of a final chronological settlement.

[3] "In hoc synodali conventu . . . . omnes sacerdotes Dei, et comites et præfecti prioris synodi decreta consentientes firmaverunt, seque ea implere velle promiserunt" (can. I.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of clergy and laity, and to prevent the sale of Christian slaves to the heathen, or the practice of pagan rites. Illustrative of the unsettled state of the times was a decree to allow those who were holding confiscated Church lands still to retain them, on condition of paying a specified sum of money, owing to impending war. In the month of August[1] of the same year Hartbert took to Rome letters to the Pope from Carloman, Pippin and Boniface, in which, as may be gathered from the Pope's reply,[2] for the originals appear to be lost, Zachary was informed of the holding of the council, and asked to send palliums to Grimo, Abel and Hartbert, archbishops respectively of Rouen, Rheims, and Sens. In his answer to Boniface, Zachary says that he has sent the desired palliums, and also letters on the use of the pallium, to the prelates in question, and praises him for having condemned "two false prophets in the province of the Franks," and put them in prison. The said false prophets were two heretics who claimed to be bishops. One a Frank, Adalbert by name, professed, not unlike Mahomet and Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormons, to have received from heaven by angelic hands letters and relics, had himself worshipped, distributed his hair and nails as relics to his infatuated followers, and taught other equally outrageous doctrines. Clement, the other heretical opponent of St. Boniface, went astray in the matter of morals both in theory and practice; and in dogma held that when Our Lord 'descended into hell,' he did not leave any one there (where by 'hell' he in-

Adalbert and Clement.

[1] This date is got from Zachary's letter of the 5th Nov. 743? (ep. 143, ed. *S.*; ep. 58, ed. *D.*), who in that letter speaks of the letter "quæ a tua directæ sunt fraternitate per elapsum Augustum mensem, ubi nobis indicasti quod et consilium, adjuvante Deo et Carlomanno præbente consensum factum est," etc.

[2] Ep. 144, ed. *S.*; 57 *D.* *Cf.* Ep. 143 *S.*; 58 *D.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cluded the abode of the lost as well as that of the souls of the just who were waiting for the coming of Christ), denied the Catholic rule of faith, viz., Scripture and Tradition, as interpreted by the living voice of the Church, and erred on the matter of predestination and other fundamental truths of Catholic teaching.[1]

Boniface hints at simony in Rome. 743 (?).

Before the last cited letter of the Pope reached Boniface, he had sent off another to the Pope, in which he only asked for one pallium, viz., for Grimo of Rouen, and hinted at some simoniacal practices. Unfortunately Boniface's letter is not forthcoming. Replying to this letter on November 5, 743 or 744, Zachary expresses[2] his astonishment at the demand for only one pallium, and adds: "In your letter we find what has greatly upset us. You speak as though we . . . . which God forbid, and our clergy had fallen into the heresy of Simon Magus, and had compelled those to whom we sent palliums to give us money. But we exhort you, dearest brother, never again write to us in that strain. To impute to us what we thoroughly detest, is to treat us very injuriously. The three palliums which, at your suggestion, we were asked for, as well as the letters

[1] On these heretics, *cf.* Epp. 134–5, 139, 144–8, ed. *S.*, or 59, 77, 57, 62, ed. *D.*, of St. Boniface. "Alium (Clementem) ita luxuriæ deditum, ut concubinam haberet," ep. 144, ed. *S.*; 57, ed. *D.*

[2] Ep. 143, ed. *S.*; 58 *D.* Of course there are always some moderns able to fill up any lacunæ by their 'ipse dixit'; and Mr. Kellet, *Pope Gregory the Great*, Appendix I., p. 91, asserts that "his (Boniface's) influence was not sufficient, however, to persuade two of these (archbishops) to recognise the authority of Rome so far as to beg the pallium from the Pope." But, as we have seen, *none* of them asked for the pallium themselves. Boniface asked for the palliums for them. And to judge from a letter of Boniface to the Pope (ep. 141, ed. *S.*; ep. 86, *D.*) some years later, it seems clear that the difficulty in the way of appointing the three metropolitans arose from the rulers of the Franks not keeping their word. "De palliis a Romana ecclesia petendis . . . . indulgentiam Apostolicæ sedis flagito; quia quod promiserunt (Franci), tardantes non impleverunt . . . . quid inde perficere voluerint, ignoratur; sed mea voluntate impleta esset promissio."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of confirmation and instruction, we have granted without receiving anything from anybody." In conclusion, so little was the Pope displeased at the plain speaking of our saint, that the sphere of Boniface's action was enlarged by the Pope. Jurisdiction was given to him over all Gaul.[1]

Synod of Soissons, 744.

Through the unceasing energy of Boniface, who at once took advantage of his extended legatine powers, there were renewed in Neustria, at a synod[2] of Soissons (March 2, 744), the decrees that had already been passed in the synods in Austrasia. But corruption was more deep-seated in Neustria. There were the worldly bishops—such as Milo of Rheims, whom Abel had been elected to succeed, but who was too strong to be dislodged—whom Charles Martel had intruded into the various Sees; and the introduction of reform was stoutly resisted. Carloman and Pepin were, however, in earnest in the matter, and by their united efforts a council was held in 745, at which bishops from both parts of the kingdom were present. With regard to this synod, we are about as much in the dark as we are with the others at which St. Boniface presided or which he summoned. Indeed, some authors[3] identify this synod with that of Liftinæ. Among the other deeds of this council seem to have been the condemnation of Adalbert and Clement, whom we have seen imprisoned by St. Boniface to await their trial at a council; the deposition of Gervilio (Gewilieb), archbishop of Mayence, for having assassinated the man who had killed his father; and the excommunication of various clerics for irregular life. To establish proper canonical jurisdiction, it was decided that Boniface should have a

Combined synods of Austrasia and Neustria, 745.

[1] "Ea, quæ tibi largitus est decessor et prædecessor noster . . . . augemus; . . . . et omnem Galliarum provinciam . . . . nostra vice . . . . spiritualiter studeas normâ reformare." *Ib.*

[2] Héfélé, iv. p. 422 f., Fr. trans. Bartolini, p. 136 (36).

[3] *Cf.* Héfélé, iv. p. 428 f., Fr. ed.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fixed metropolitan See; and as the See of Cologne was vacant and was thought to be suitable, for it was on the border of country still pagan, it was resolved that the Pope be asked to sanction Cologne as a metropolitan See.[1]

In fine, from a letter which St. Boniface about this time wrote to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, we learn that the council subscribed to a profession of faith and proclaimed their loyalty to the See of Rome. "Our synod declared[2] that to the end of their lives they wish to preserve Catholic faith and unity and subjection to the Roman Church, to St. Peter and his Vicar. We also decreed that metropolitans should ask for their palliums from that See, and that we would, in accordance with canon law, follow in all things the decrees of Blessed Peter, that we might be numbered among the sheep entrusted to his care." The sequel of this letter shows that the decrees issued in preceding councils for the reformation of discipline were renewed[3] in this general synod of the Franks.

Zachary is thankful for the holding of this synod, 745.

As soon as the Pope received word of this council, in

[1] This the Pope did. Ep. 138 *S.*; 60 *D.* Oct. 31, 745.

[2] Ep. 105 *S.*; 78 *D.* "Decrevimus in nostro synodali conventu, et confessi sumus fidem Catholicam et unitatem, et subjectionem Romanæ Ecclesiæ, fine tenus vitæ nostræ, velle servare: sancto Petro et Vicario ejus velle subjici; . . . . Metropolitanos ab illa sede quærere; et, per omnia, præcepta Petri canonice sequi desiderare; ut inter oves sibi commendatas numeremur." Dümmler assigns this letter to 747.

[3] It is touching to see in this letter how, in his zeal for the advancement of God's glory, Boniface seemed to himself to have effected nothing, because he did not see after this synod an instantaneous general improvement in morals. He says he is like a dog who can only bark whilst he sees the thieves 'break through and steal.' "Cujus synodum congregandam et hortandam jussu Pontificis Romani, et rogatu principum Francorum et Gallorum, suscepi. Circumfodi, cophinum stercoris apportavi. . . . Sed, proh dolor, officium laboris mei . . . . simillimum esse videtur cani latranti, et venienti fures et latrones frangere, subfodere, domum Domini sui, et quia defensionis auxiliatores non habeat, submurmurans ingemiscat, et lugeat."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a letter[1] addressed to "all the bishops, priests, deacons and abbots; and to all the dukes, counts, and God-fearing men throughout the 'Gauls' (per Gallias) and provinces of the Franks," Zachary thanks God that the synod he had ordered had been held, through the help of their 'princes, Pippin and Carloman,' and the agency of his vicar Boniface; he exhorts them to persevere in their obedience to Boniface, who is acting in his stead, and in assembling in synod every year; and finally promises them victory over their pagan foes, if they put in practice the decrees of reform which they have passed.

Second synod at Rome on Adalbert and Clement, etc., 745.

The next step taken by Zachary was to call a council[2] of seven bishops of Sees in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome. This synod was held in the basilica of Theodore (afterwards the oratory of St. Venantius), in the Lateran Palace, October 25, 745. With the bishops were seventeen priests of the Roman church—among whom we find three Stephens, one of whom, at least, doubtless sat on the chair of Peter. A rather more detailed account of this synod will perhaps be found interesting. When the bishops and priests were assembled, the book of the Gospels in their midst, with the deacons and inferior clergy standing round, Gregory, the regionary[3] notary, and nomenclator,[4] said: "The priest Deneard, the

[1] Ep. 137, ed. *S.*; 61 *D.* Bartolini, p. (11). Dated by Jaffé and Dümmler, Oct. 31, 745.

[2] Ep. 135 *S.*; 59 *D.* Bartolini, p. 162 and (47).

[3] The appointment of seven regionary deacons, one to each of the ecclesiastical regions of the city, to take down the acts of the martyrs is generally ascribed to Pope Clement I. These were afterwards called protonotaries. *Cf. sup.*, p. 103.

[4] The business of the nomenclator (an important office in the papal court) was to write out the names of those who were to be invited to the Pope's table (*cf.* Ducange in voce). Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. 443), quoting a fragment that may date from the end of the tenth century, calls the nomenclator "the special proctor of wards, widows, prisoners and oppressed."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

envoy of the most holy Boniface, archbishop of the province of Germany, is without, and craves admittance. What are your wishes?" On this, Deneard was allowed to enter, and said: "My Lord! when in obedience to your orders my master, Bishop Boniface, had assembled a synod in the province of the Franks, and had exposed the heresies of Adalbert and Clement, they were deposed; and, acting in harmony with the princes of the Franks, he has put them in prison. However, they remain impenitent and continue to seduce the people. Hence I present you this letter of my masters, that you may make it binding in council." In obedience to orders, the notary and treasurer Theophanius read the said letter, in which Boniface informed the Pope that, since the council which he had held by his orders, he had had a great deal to put up with from bad priests, and especially from Adalbert and Clement, "men[1] unlike in their errors but equal in crime." Zachary is therefore asked himself to condemn these men, that the people may the more readily leave their errors. What those errors, as well of abstract dogma as of practical morality, were, we have already seen, so that there is no need of repeating their enumeration by further extracts from this letter. The reading of this document of the archbishop brought the first session to a close. In the next session, after the reading of Adalbert's wild autobiography, and of the letter which, written to him by Our Lord, had dropped from heaven, the Pope remarked that only those with the minds of women or children could pay any attention to writings of that description. In the third session a prayer was read which Adalbert had written to himself, and in which angels with

[1] "Specie erroris diversi, sed pondere peccatorum pares." Ep. 59 *D.* Bartolini, p. 158 (46).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

names,[1] such as Uriel, Raguel, etc., were invoked. Zachary ordered these extraordinary productions to be stored in the archives[2] of the church, and the synod declared the two heretics degraded, and, along with their followers, anathematised.

A few days after the synod was over, the Pope wrote[3] to Boniface, bidding him not to be disheartened if the enemy had oversown with cockle the field in which he had laboured so hard, sympathising with him on the damage which a late inroad of barbarians had wrought in his flock by reminding him that the 'Roman state' has often been depopulated by like causes, congratulating him on the great synod he had held, approving of the establishment of Cologne as his metropolitical See, replying to various questions[4] about the rebaptising of heretics, etc., which Boniface had asked him in three different letters, and sending him a copy of the condemnation of Adalbert and Clement in the hope that those who heard it read would give up their impiety.

Zachary sends word to Boniface about this council, etc., 745.

Adalbert and Clement, either in their own persons or

Adalbert and Clement again to be examined, 745.

[1] On these names of supposed angels, *cf.* Bartolini, p. 170 f.

[2] "Oportunum est ut in sancto nostro scrinio referentur." Ep. 59 *D.*

[3] Ep. 138, ed. *S.*; 60 *D.* Bartolini, p. 197 (52).

[4] Ep. 134, ed. *S.*; 68 *D.* Two 'religiosi viri' (priests), Virgilius and Sidonius, had written to the Pope to say that Boniface had ordered them to rebaptise those whom an ignorant priest had baptised "in nomine patria, et filia," etc. Zachary accordingly wrote to Boniface that if such were the case—we have no letter of Boniface to let us know whether it was or not—those who had been thus baptised were not to be rebaptised. This letter bears the date 744 or 746. Virgilius and Sidonius were from the 'province of Bavaria.' As in another letter (Ep. 140, ed. *S.*; 80 *D.*), the Pope declares that, with regard to the priests Virgilius and Sidonius, he acknowledges what Boniface has written, and says that of course more credit is due to his word than theirs, it is possible that the two were not telling the truth in the matter of this question of rebaptising. Ep. 142, ed. *S.*; 87 *D.*, gives answers to a great many other questions asked by Boniface, on various points of Canon Law, etc. This letter is dated Nov. 4, 751.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

through their friends, apparently put forward some plea why judgment should be stayed. For on January 5, 747,[1] the Pope wrote to Boniface to tell him that he had sent answers to different questions on the subjects of clerics and matrimony propounded to him by Pippin; and that, at the synod that he (Boniface) must call to make the answers public, he was to summon the two sacrilegious and contumacious ex-bishops[2] Adalbert and Clement, that their cause[2] might be again thoroughly sifted. If, on being convicted of error, they show themselves wishful to turn to the right path, the synod and the prince of the province are to treat them as they think proper, in accordance with the canons. If, on the other hand, they continue with proud obstinacy to proclaim their innocence, they are to be sent with two or three most prudent and upright priests to the Pope, who will thoroughly investigate their cause himself and treat them as they may deserve. As to what these men finally became history is silent. Adalbert at least, as the Pope himself observed in the synod at Rome, was certainly insane; so that it

[1] Such is the date of the letter (Ep. 139, ed. *S.*; 77 *D.*) as we now have it; and so it is dated by Jaffé. Bartolini, however, refers it, along with a decretal letter sent to Pippin at the same time (viz., ep. 'Gaudio magno') which is mentioned in the letter in question to Boniface, to the year 744, before the Council of Soissons (Bart., pp. 117–8). The date 747 is kept here on account of the mention of a 'second thorough investigation' of the case of the two heretics. The letter to Pippin (ap. Cenni, i. 41; ap. Migne, *Cod. Carol.*, tom. 98) consists of 27 decrees on various topics, such as divorce, fallen religious, etc., which show at least the disorders from which the Church in France was suffering, and the ignorance of its clergy, who had to ask the solution to such questions. For the letter is addressed to the "bishops and abbots in the country of the Franks," as well as to Pippin.

[2] "Ad medium deducantur sacrilegi illi et contumaces, Adelberthus .... et Clemens, Exepiscopi, ut eorum denuo, subtili indagatione, cribretur causa."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

is to be hoped that some milder asylum than a prison was found for him.

Zachary encourages and supports Boniface, 747–8.

In the midst of all his difficulties, Boniface had a firm friend in the Pope. In the letters that he wrote to Boniface there were always kind words of encouragement, and in the letters that he wrote to other bishops[1] he always supported the authority of Boniface, reminding them that their archbishop was acting for him, that is, for Blessed Peter. He would not send another[2] to hold councils and represent the Apostolic See whilst Boniface lived. In every way Zachary showed himself a hearty co-operator in the work Boniface was about.

Virgil and the 'Antipodes,' 748.

And certainly that help was needed. Boniface was beset by ignorant or malicious opponents. One of these foes is more particularly well known from an idea that, as a man very much in advance of his age, he taught the existence of the antipodes; and that the Pope in his ignorance condemned the said teaching. The *facts* of the case are these. In the letter just quoted (Ep. 80 *D.*), the Pope writes: "I understand from your letter that Virgilius (I forget whether[3] he was described as a priest) has been acting maliciously against you, because you

[1] *Cf.* Ep. 136 *S.*; 82 *D.*, to Reginfrid of Rouen and some dozen other bishops.

[2] Ep. 140 *S.*; 80 *D.* Dated May 1, 748 (?).

[3] "Nescimus si dicatur presbyter"—important words, as they show that this Virgilius is not the same as the one mentioned in connection with the 'baptism in nomine patria,' etc. (see *sup.*, p. 245, note 4), who, both in this letter (ep. 80 *D.*) and in the preceding one, is mentioned along with Sidonius. In Ep. 68 *D.* the two are described as 'religious men' (viri religiosi), and in this very letter, in the paragraph following the one now being cited in the text, the two are set down as 'priests.' The said paragraph begins: "Pro Sidonio autem supra dicto, et *Virgilio*, presbyteris, quod scripsit sanctitas tua, agnovimus." Evidently the subject matter and the individuals treated of in this paragraph are different to those discussed in the one quoted in the text.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

showed that he had wandered from true Catholic teaching, trying to make enmity between you and Odilo, Duke of Bavaria. Nor is it true, as he says, that he has been absolved by me so that he may obtain the diocese of the deceased bishop,[1] who was one of the four that you consecrated in Bavaria. If it be true, moreover, that he teaches[2] that beneath the earth there is another world and other men, call a council, excommunicate him, and (if he be a priest) deprive him of his dignity. We have, however, ourselves written to the duke about Virgil, and sent a letter to the latter summoning him to appear before us, that he may be condemned, if, after a careful examination, he be found to err in his teaching."

The above passage contains all that is known of the teaching of Virgil relative to 'another world.' It cannot, therefore, be stated with any degree of certainty whether, arguing from the rotundity[3] of the world, he simply inferred the existence of antipodes, or whether he went a step

[1] There is, further, no reason for believing that this Virgil, who in 748 was intriguing for a bishopric, is the same as St. Virgilius, the famous Irishman who was the apostle of Carinthia, and who became bishop of Salzburg in 768, some twenty years later. (See Gams, *Series Episcop.*, p. 307; Bartolini and the authorities on the *Life of St. Virgil*, p. 385; and *The Conversion of the Teutonic Race*, ii. p. 168.) By a judicious combination of these three Virgils, Bower (*Hist. of the Popes*), quite in his own way, makes a very *edifying* story! Bishop Healy, however (*Ireland's Schools*, p. 566 f.), also treating these Virgils as one, tells the story of Virgil or Fergil very differently.

[2] "Si clarificatum fuerit, ita eum confiteri, quod alius mundus, et alii homines sub terras sint, hunc . . . . ab ecclesia pelle." Ep. 80 *D.*

[3] That the world was a sphere was held by many of the Fathers, *e.g.*, St. Augustine (*De civit. Dei*, xvi. 9. He writes: "Etiamsi figura conglobata et rotunda esse credatur, *sine aliqua ratione monstratur*"); Philoponus (*De mund. creat.*, iii. c. 12 and 13, ap. Galland, xii. pp. 535–7); Bede (*De Nat. Rer.*, c. 46), where he says: "terra figuram absoluti orbis efficiat," ap. Lingard, *Ang.-Sax. Church*, ii. p. 158), etc. Hence some Fathers inferred the existence of the antipodes, *e.g.*, St. Hilary (*in Psalm.*, n. 32); Origen (*De Princip.*, l. ii. c. 3, n. 6, ed. De la Rue); Pope St. Clement (ep. 1, ad. Cor. n. 20); whilst on the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

further and argued, on the old pagan lines,[1] for the existence of antipodeans, who constituted an *entirely different race of men, not descended from Adam.* If Virgil confined himself to the first conclusion, he would not have been condemned by the Pope; but if he taught the second, he would, as that conclusion is opposed to the teaching of the Church on the redemption of all men by Our Lord. And here it may be observed in general, that, despite all the assertions of her rash critics to the contrary, the Church does not attempt to condemn the legitimate conclusions of science from its own data in its own domain. The Church only raises her protest when scientific conclusions are introduced into the realm of theology, and scientific data are made to take the place of theological data.

Boniface fixes his metro-political See at Mayence, 751.

Already, in his letter of May 1, 748, the Pope speaks of Boniface as then residing not at Cologne, but at Mayence. He gives as the reason of this that the 'Franks had not kept their promise.' Three years later, in response to the united wishes of Boniface himself and that of the 'sons of the Franks,' Zachary issued a decree[2] to Boniface, in which he decided that, "by the authority of Blessed Peter, the Church of Mayence be for ever the metro-political See of you and your successors, and that it have subject to it the five cities (*civitates*) of Tongres, Cologne, Worms, Spires and Utrecht, and all the nations of

other hand, in the absence of evidence, some like St. Augustine (*ib.*) and Lactantius, *Instit.*, iii. 24, did not believe in their existence. Though St. Augustine makes it quite plain (*ib.*, c. 8) that wherever *men* are to be found on this earth, they are the descendants of Adam.

[1] *Cf. Somnium Scipionis.* On this subject of the ancients and the antipodes, and the condemnation by Pope Zachary, *cf.* Barthélemy, *Erreurs et Mensonges Historiques*, vol. i.; Bartolini, pp. 380–388.

[2] Nov. 4, 751. *Cf.* Ep. 88 *D.*; Bartolini, p. 494 and (84). "Obtinere voluisti (Bonifacius), ut tibi cathedralem Ecclesiam . . . . confirmare debeamus, juxta eorundem filiorum Francorum petitionem."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Germany, to whom, by your preaching, you have brought the light of Christ."[1]

Boniface's monastery of Fulda, 751.

In one of the last letters that Boniface sent to Zachary, he wrote[2]: "In the midst of a vast solitude there is a woody spot, in the midst of which I have built a monastery, and placed therein monks of the order of St. Benedict, men who lead a very strict life, abstaining from flesh and wine, and working with their own hands. This place was the gift particularly of Carloman, once Prince of the Franks. I have dedicated it to Our Saviour. Thither, with your consent, I would retire for a few days at a time to recruit the strength of my aged frame, and there would I like to lie after my death." The monastery here spoken of is the famous monastery of Fulda, one of the greatest centres of learning in Germany in the Middle Ages.

In his reply[3] (November 4, 751) to this letter of Boniface, the Pope says that he has granted Boniface's request in the matter of the monastery; and there is extant[4] the brief by which Zachary frees the monastery from subjection to any jurisdiction but that of Rome. This exemption Boniface then managed to get confirmed[5] by Pippin, 'King of the Franks,' for the "love of God and the veneration he bore St. Peter." Here, once again, must we leave the narrative of St. Boniface's connection with the See of Rome (a see with which it was his one wish always to be on the best of terms—*cupio . . . . in*

[1] "B. Petri auctoritate sancimus, ut supradicta ecclesia Moguntina, atque etiam perpetuis temporibus tibi et successoribus tuis Metropolis sit confirmata," etc., *ib.* The document was ordered to be preserved in the archives of the church of Mayence.

[2] Ep. 141, ed. *S.*; 86 *D.*, an. 751.

[3] Ep. 142, ed. *S.*; 87 *D.*

[4] 89 *D.* This privilege Zachary had already granted to Mt. Cassino (see *infra*, p. 258). From his acts in favour of the monks, and other reasons, Bartolini thinks that Zachary was himself a Benedictine monk.

[5] Ep. 151, ed. *S.*; or ap. Othlonum, *in vit. S. Bonif.*, p. 81.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

familiaritate Romanæ ecclesiæ . . . . perseverare, ep. 86) to conclude it under the *Life* of Pope Stephen (II.) III.

His amiability.

In seeking for the causes of the wonderful success achieved by our great countryman "among the races of Germany to whom he was sent," there is no doubt that, apart from his burning zeal and his capacity for work, which for so many years he strained to its utmost tension, one of the chief ones was the amiability of his character. This it was before which opposition melted away, this made all wishful to work with him, this attached all men to him. Not only was he beloved by the popes, who, as we have seen, would have had him always with them, but he was dear to the whole Roman Church. Its deacons and its archdeacons were constantly writing to him the kindest of letters, and sending him presents. He had the greatest influence with the 'Princes of the Franks,' who ever showed themselves ready to do all he wanted; and the people of his country, whether men or women, were always most devoted to him. Every letter that is addressed to him is full of affectionate language. Hence, not unnaturally, is one loath to leave the delightful collection of his letters and those of his friends.

Zachary sends 'apocrisiarii' to Constantinople, 742.

In the early part of the year 742 Zachary sent legates to Constantine V. with letters, as well for the emperor as for the Church of Constantinople. The emperor was exhorted[1] to restore the holy images, and the Church of Constantinople was put in receipt of the Pope's synodical letter or profession of faith. On their arrival in Constantinople, the legates found that Constantine V. was no longer in power there. Taking advantage of his absence on a campaign against the Saracens, his brother-in-law, the orthodox Artavasdus, took possession of the imperial

[1] *Cf.* the letter of Pope Hadrian I., read in the second session of the Seventh General Council, and the *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

city, and had himself crowned towards the close of the year 741. The papal ambassadors were prudent[1] enough not to recognise the usurper, but in retirement awaited the issue of events. It was not long before Constantine appeared with an army before his capital, and by November 743 Byzantium was in his hands and the cause of Artavasdus was lost. Pleased at the action of the Pope's legates, Constantine had them sought out, and for once showed himself well disposed to the Church of Rome. For in accordance with the expressed wish of the Pope, the emperor, in writing, granted to Zachary and the Roman Church for ever the two estates known by the names of Nympha and Normia (now Norma), which had till then remained in the hands of the emperor.[2] These two estates were of very considerable value; and it has been suggested that Constantine wished to make some compensation for the confiscation of the Calabrian and Sicilian patrimonies.

But Zachary had not much communication with the East, at least as far as our knowledge goes. Such as he had was confined to writing[3] to the emperor from time to time, to

[1] Finlay (*Byzantine Empire*, p. 56) says: "The Pope acknowledged him (Artavasdus) as emperor." This statement is only true if the Pope's use of his name in dating documents be regarded as an acknowledgment of his claims. It is not certain whether Artavasdus reigned from 741–3 or from 742–4.

[2] "Donationem in scriptis de duabus massis, quæ Nymphas et Normias appellantur, *juris publici existentes*, ... Papæ S. R. E. *jure* perpetuo direxit possidendas." (*L. P.*) These two cities were in the territory that used to be inhabited by the Volscians. Norma was built on the top of a lofty precipice. Was it the strength of its position that kept it independent of the Duchy of Rome? Bartolini (p. 108) argues that this cession of these cities to the Pope shows that the emperor implicitly recognised the temporal sovereignty of the Pope over the Duchy of Rome. What had been under the jurisdiction of the empire (cities—juris publici existentes) was made subject to the jurisdiction of the See of Rome (jure S. R. E. possidendas.)

[3] The letter cited above of Pope Hadrian states that Pope Zachary and other popes "*sæpius* avum seu genitorem vestræ tranquillitatis pro

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

beg him to give up his persecution of 'image worship' and its adherents. Whilst Zachary was Pope, Constantine V. was so much occupied, first with the rebellion of Artavasdus and then with the ravages of a great plague, that he had not much leisure to attend to the image controversy, or the relations between them might have been more frequent than pleasant. For the persecution against those who dared to oppose the imperial will in the matter of the 'images' still went on; and unless he has been very much maligned by Theophanes,[1] Constantine's character seems to have been on a par with his nickname, Copronymus.

Synod at Rome, 743.

Whilst pushing on reform in the Frankish kingdom, through his legate Boniface, the Pope did not neglect to attend to needed reforms at home. In the autumn of 743 he presided over a synod of some forty bishops, twenty-two priests and six deacons,[2] in which fifteen decrees were promulgated. These decrees regulated various points of discipline in connection with bishops, priests and nuns; forbade marriages within certain degrees of kindred;

statuendis Imaginibus deprecati sunt." The letter was addressed to Constantine and Irene.

[1] Ad an. 732. Finlay (*The Byzantine Empire*, p. 53), after asserting, "Historians tell us that Constantine was a man possessing every vice disgraceful to humanity, combined with habits and tastes which must have rendered his company disgusting and his person contemptible," proceeds to ascribe "the obloquy heaped on his name," "to the blind passion inspired by religious bigotry." On this method of dealing with the evidence of respectable contemporary authorities, our readers must judge for themselves. Theophanes and Nicephorus may not in the telling have underrated the vices of Constantine; perhaps they may even have given expression to what the 'image worshippers' *said* about the emperor. But after making due allowance for these possibilities, Constantine's character was undoubtedly brutal. *Cf.* Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, ii. 460–1, 6.

[2] *Cf.* Mansi, xii. 381; Héfélé, *Conciles*, iv. 419. Among the names of the priests and deacons occur several 'Stephens' and one Paul—doubtless some of Zachary's successors.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

anathematised those who kept the 1st of January[1] and the 25th of December (the feast of Bacchus) after the pagan fashion, as well as those who sold Christian slaves[2] to the Jews; and ordered disputes between clerics to be settled by the bishops or by the Pope, and that all bishops who are subject to the Pope (as patriarch of the West) come 'ad limina apostolorum' (viz., to Rome, to the Pope), if near at hand, every year on the 15th of May, but if they reside at a distance, in accordance with their 'indult.'[3]

Carloman becomes a monk, 747.

One of the events that made the greatest stir in Zachary's reign, not only in Rome, but over a large part of Europe, was the arrival (747) in the Eternal City of the great and successful Prince of the Franks, Carloman, to become a monk. His departure for Rome and his becoming a monk is noted in chronicle after chronicle.[4] The influence[5] of St. Boniface upon him had been very great, and under it he strove to advance in virtue day by day. But as he felt that he could not make that progress towards perfection which he wished whilst still 'in the world,' he chose,

[1] *Cf. sup.*, p. 235 note.

[2] Discovering that some Venetian merchants had come to Rome and bought up a number of serfs to sell to the Moslems in Africa, Zachary, deciding that it was not right that those cleansed with the baptism of Christ should serve infidels, put an end to the vile traffic, gave the merchants their price, and freed the poor serfs (*L. P.* in vit.). *Cf. Cod. C.*, ep. 65, Migne, 64, for action of Pope Hadrian against the Greek slave trade.

[3] Can. 4. "Omnes episcopi, qui hujus Apostolicæ Sedis ordinationi subjacebunt, qui propinqui sunt, annue Idibus mensis Maii SS. Petri et Pauli liminibus præsententur: qui vero de longinquo, *juxta chirographum suum impleant.*" De Sauclières and Héfélé both, by some mistake, give the canon as though those bishops who lived at a distance had simply 'to write'! *Cf.* the *Liber Diurnus*, F. 74, *Cautio Episcopi.* (Bartolini, p. 87 note.)

[4] A considerable number of them are cited by Bartolini, p. 227 f.

[5] *Cf.* Othlo's *Life of St. Boniface*, l. i. p. 74.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

continues[1] the biographer of St. Boniface, "the best part, which shall not be taken away from him" (St. Luke x. 42). That is to say, he determined to embrace the *religious life*. According to one chronicle,[2] his desire to leave the world was quickened by the reflection of the thousands of men who had fallen in the wars he had had to undertake. However that may be, he entrusted his kingdom and his son to the charge of his brother Pippin, and, with a numerous train of followers, bearing considerable presents for the Pope from both Pippin and himself, betook him to Rome, and at the hands of Pope Zachary[3] received the clerical tonsure and the habit of a monk. At first he withdrew to Mount Soracte, some twenty-eight miles from Rome, to a monastery which he had himself built,[4] and which may still be seen. "He there enjoyed for several years the repose he sought for, in company with the brothers of the order (Benedictine) who had gone with him. He was, however, obliged to change his place of residence, because many of the Frankish nobility, when making pilgrimages to Rome to fulfil their vows, broke, by their frequent visits to him, that quiet which he most of all desired, since they were unwilling to pass by unnoticed one who had formerly been their king. As constant interruptions of this sort hindered the object of his retirement, he betook himself (by the advice of the Pope)[5] to the monastery

[1] *Cf.* Othlo's *Life of St. Boniface*, l. ii. p. 80. "Quum eandem dilectionem (Dei et proximi), non ea quæ voluit integritate in sæculari habitu constitutus, implere prævaleret, elegit optimam partem, quæ non auferetur ab eo."

[2] *Ann. Petav.*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, vol. i., ed. Hanov. "Karolomannus intravit Alamanniam, ubi fertur quod multa hominum milia ceciderit. Unde compunctus regnum reliquit," etc., ad an. 746. Dr. Hodgkin, *Italy*, etc., vii. 109, argues with some probability that the slaughter here alluded to was of a *treacherous* character.

[3] *L. P.* in vit.; *Chron. Moissiac*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i., etc.

[4] *Annal. Wirziburg.*, ap. Pertz, *ib.*, ii. [5] *Chron. Moissiac.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of St. Benedict on Mount Cassino, in the province of Samnium, and there passed the remainder of his life in religious exercises."[1] The last remark of Charlemagne's famous biographer is, as we shall see later, not quite accurate. At the bidding of his abbot Gratianus, he left his monastery in the year 753, and went to France to try to ward off from the said monastery the destruction with which the Lombard king Aistulfus threatened it. He died at a monastery in Vienne in 755.

The council of Cloveshoe, Sept. 747.

In the same year in which he bestowed the monastic habit on Carloman, Zachary was working for an improvement in morals in England. Informed of the decay in discipline that began to set in after the death of the great archbishop Theodore, the Pope ordered a council to be held, and those who should oppose its decrees to be anathematised. The letters of the Pope conveying these orders are lost, but of their *former* existence and purport the opening words[2] of the council itself assure us. The synod was opened with the reading of two letters received from the Pope, "who was held in reverence by the whole world." These letters were read "as the Pope had himself ordered, with the greatest care, first in Latin and then in an English translation. In these writings he admonished the people of this island, lovingly exhorted them, and finally threatened to cut off from

[1] Eginhard's *Vita Carol.*, c. 2, Eng. trans.

[2] "Scripta toto orbe venerandi pontificis papæ Zachariæ in duabus chartis prolata sunt, et cum magna diligentia, *juxta quod* ipse apostolica sua auctoritate præcepit, et manifeste recitata, et in nostra quoque lingua apertius interpretata sunt. Quibus namque scriptis, Britanniæ hujus insulæ nostri generis accolas familiariter prænonebat . . . . et hæc omnia contemnentibus . . . . anathematis sententiam proferendam insinuabat." (Wilkins, *Conc.*, i. 94; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360 f.) The eloquent letters of St. Boniface to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the dissolute Ethelbald, King of Mercia, had doubtless done much to direct attention to the need of reform.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the communion of the Church, all who should despise his warning and obstinately persist in their wickedness." There assembled (September 747) at the council, held at Cloveshoe, which some think to have been a town near Rochester, and others Abingdon, then known as Sheovsham, some dozen bishops and a considerable number of ecclesiastics, Ethelbald, King of Mercia, and thirty-three of his chief nobility.[1] Over thirty canons were drawn up for the reform of the clergy and monastic bodies, for the better rendering of the divine service, and for the general advancement of piety. Hence every effort was ordered to be made to foster a love of study and the Holy Scriptures; and in whatever regarded the Mass and the sacred chant, all were commanded to follow the customs and teachings 'of the Roman Church.'[2] Altogether the decrees[3] of Cloveshoe were of a most useful and practical order. Well worthy are they of being read and studied at any time. They cannot fail to have been productive of good in the eighth century.

Zachary consecrates the new basilica of Monte Cassino, 748.

The year 748 is a most important one in the history of monasticism. In that year was completed the restoration of Monte Cassino, the chief seat of the greatest religious order that has ever graced and strengthened the Church—the Benedictine. The work, begun by the abbot Petronax[4] under the auspices of Gregory II., was continued by the same zealous monk with the aid of

[1] Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, i.

[2] *Cf.* canons 13, 15, 16, 18. "Celebrentur juxta exemplar, videlicet quod scriptum de Romana habemus ecclesia." Wilkins, i. 96. Stubbs, iii. 367.

[3] *Cf.* Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, i. pp. 111–3, and note G; Héfélé (Fr. ed.), iv. p. 466 *seq.*; Flanagan, *Hist. of the Church in England*, i. p. 157 f.; Bartolini, 247 f.

[4] *Cf. sup.*, p. 163; Paul the Deacon (vi. 40), who adds that Zachary, 'the first of priests' (sacerdotum præcipuus), gave great assistance to Petronax. *Cf. infra.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Gregory III., and completed with such munificent assistance from Pope Zachary, that the credit of the entire restoration was assigned to him.[1] Attended by thirteen archbishops and sixty-eight bishops, Zachary performed the dedication ceremony, venerated the bodies of St. Benedict and his sister St. Scholastica, confirmed the various donations and possessions of the monastery, exempted the abbot from any episcopal jurisdiction, except from that of Rome, granted him certain of the honours that are usually confined to bishops, and himself gave various presents to the monastery. Besides a copy of the Holy Scriptures—his copy of the Gospels is said to be still preserved there—he presented the abbey with the copy of his rule, which St. Benedict had written out with his own hand, and his weight for the bread and his measure for the wine which the saint allowed his monks. These precious memorials of their founder the monks had saved from the first destruction of their monastery under Zoto and his Lombards. Presented by them (the monks) to Pope Gregory II., as an act of gratitude for the kindness they had received at the hands of the popes during their sojourn in Rome, these interesting mementos were thus restored to them by Zachary.[2] The bull of Zachary, dated February 18, from Aquino, on the strength of which some of the above statements with regard to Monte Cassino and the Pope rest, has been rejected by Muratori, Jaffé and others

[1] *Cf. Chron. S. Bened.*, ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 483. "Iste (Zacharias) restauravit monasterium S. Benedicti." The Pope's bull, *Omnipotenti Deo*, printed in full by Bartolini, p. [57], in Italian, p. 278, sets forth his share in the work.

[2] *Cf.* Peter the Deacon; and Leo Ost., ap. Bartolini, p. 263 note and p. 268 respectively. The bronze weight, with the name of Pope Gregory III. let into it in small silver letters, is still to be seen at Monte Cassino.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as spurious. It has been received here as, to say the least of it, many of the arguments against its genuineness have been disproved by Troya.[1]

By another bull,[2] bearing the same date as the previous one,[3] Zachary confirmed the rule of St. Benedict, ordered the feasts of SS. Benedict, Scholastica and Maurus to be kept by the community as doubles of the first class, *i.e.*, with the same solemnity as Christmas Day.

The body of St. Benedict.

Over the authenticity especially of the first of these bulls there has been a fierce controversy—a controversy in which not a few among the best of modern historians have been engaged. We allude, of course, to the famous dispute as to whether the body of St. Benedict was or was not in the seventh century (672 or 673) removed by some Gallic monks from Monte Cassino to Fleury by the Loire. Discussion on this topic has been going on for the greater part of a thousand years; and when last summer (1901) we visited what still remains of the once glorious abbey of Fleury (viz., a fine romanesque church), we were assured that the French monks[4] had at length

[1] *Cod. Diplom. Langob.*, iv. p. 302 f., whose arguments are given in short by Bartolini, p. 264 f. The last-named author dates the origin of the creation of 'abbots *nullius*,' as they are called, from this exemption of the abbot of this monastery of Mt. Cassino from episcopal control. But from instances we have already given of similar action by the popes (*e.g.*, *cf.* p. 19 for the action of Adeodatus in France, and p. 85 for that of Sergius in England), this would seem a not quite accurate statement. By a bull of 752 (*Cum Sanctam*, ap. Bartolini, p. (84) and p. 531 f.), the authenticity of which is defended by Bartolini and others, Zachary confirmed the exemption of the clerics of the monastery of St. Denis from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Paris, and the subjection of the said clerics to their own abbot only—a privilege granted them by Landeric, Bishop of Paris.

[2] Ap. Bartol., p. (73), in Italian, p. 365.

[3] The authenticity of this bull, questioned by many, is stoutly defended by Bartolini, pp. 336–7.

[4] *Les Reliques de S. Benoît*, par le P. Dom. F. Chamard, Paris,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

settled the discussion, and that it was now acknowledged at Monte Cassino that the relics of St. Benedict which we were shown in the crypt were really the body of the great patriarch of Monasticism in the West! To those who are disposed to sneer at such lengthy and ardent discussion on such subjects, and to brand them as sterile, we would point out that this and similar disputes have at least done a very great deal to sift the sources of history, and have even led to historical discoveries.[1] Into the arena of this controversy we have no thought of entering, either to take sides or even to arbitrate. The monks of St. Benedict are doughty literary champions, and we will leave them to settle their literary difficulties themselves. We will simply observe that if the bull of Pope Zachary, *Omnipotenti Deo*, can be urged as proving[2] that the body of St. Benedict was at Monte Cassino on the date of its publication (748), there is a letter of the same Pope, written in 750–1, and seemingly more likely to be genuine[3] than the aforesaid bull, in which he exhorts the clergy of France to cause the body of St. Benedict to be restored whence it had been taken.[4] Of the rest of this letter, which treats of Pippin and Grifo, something will

1882. Bartolini, p. 259 f., gives the arguments in favour of the body never having been removed.

[1] The controversy of which we have been speaking is said to have revealed the existence of a certain Clovis III., who reigned in Neustria *c.* 672–677; *cf. Hist. de Clovis III.* (the programme of a work in preparation—whether the complete work was published I know not), par C. Grellet-Balguerie, Orleans, 1882.

[2] "Qualiter autem ejusdem patris (Benedicti) pignora . . . . sint posita perspicientes ac intemerata invenientes, pro reverentia tanti patris tangere minime ausi sumus." Ap. Bartolini, p. (58).

[3] It is regarded as such by its latest editor, Gundlach, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 467.

[4] *Ib.* "Ipsum (Benedictum) ad suum reverti tumulum, ex quo clam tultus est."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

be said when Zachary's connections with the Franks come to be treated of.

Zachary restores the Lateran, etc.

Now that a beginning has been made of treating of the work of Church restoration by Zachary, it will be convenient to mention here the rest of his labours in that direction. For though "in his days[1] the people entrusted to him by God lived in peace and happiness," there was so much to be done, in the way of keeping existing monuments in repair, that even an energetic Pope, such as Zachary, had no time to think of adding new ones. His first care was the Lateran Palace, which he practically rebuilt.[2] From the days of John VII., who built the new palace beneath the Palatine—the finding of the ruins of which has already been described—evidently no great attention had been paid to the old Lateran palace The work of Zachary, no doubt, saved it from going to complete decay. It "contained the archives of the Church and the Treasure Chamber,[3] and was the dwelling, at the same time, of the popes and their households. Enlarged by degrees, it included, besides the great basilica, several smaller churches, many oratories, triclinia or dining halls, and several chapels, among them the celebrated private chapel of the popes, called St. Lorenzo, or, later, Sancta Sanctorum."[4] In addition to the ordinary decorations, such as mosaics, paintings and images, with which the Pope adorned the Lateran, he had painted a large fresco[5] map of the world, which doubtless furnished Giovanni da Udine with the idea for

[1] *L. P.* in vit.

[2] *Ib.* "Omne patriarchium pene a novo restauravit. In magna enim penuria eundem locum invenerat."

[3] *Ib.* "Ubi etiam et omnem substantiam suam per manus Ambrosii primicerii notariorum introduci mandavit."

[4] Gregorovius, ii. 268. *Cf.* Bartolini, p. 208 f., and p. 418 f.

[5] "Et orbis terrarum descriptionem depinxit," *ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

those similar maps that now adorn one of the loggias of the Vatican.

Among the gifts presented by Zachary to the basilica of St. Peter were his own copies of the Psalter, the antiphonary of St. Gregory and the lives of the saints which are recited at Matins. One of these is still preserved in the Vatican Library.[1]

Discovery of the head of St. George.

Of special interest to us in this country was the finding of the head of St. George. Probably whilst some repairs were in progress at the Lateran palace, a box was discovered in which was found a skull, which, from an attached label in Greek characters, was shown to be the head of St. George. With great joy both pastor and people assembled at the Lateran. With hymns and canticles the sacred relic was transported by the Pope's orders to the deaconry (*diaconia*) of St. George (in the second region of the city), known as 'ad Velum aureum' (Velabro).[2] The mention of St. George in Velabro belonging to the second region of the city shows us that at least part of the tenth imperial region —(the Palatine Region)—was included in the second ecclesiastical region.[3] The church of the deaconry was completely restored by the Pope, and placed in charge of some Greek monks of the order of St. Basil, who had fled to Rome to escape the persecution of the Iconoclast

[1] Bartolini, p. 213 note.

[2] "In venerabili Patriarchio sacratissimum b. Georgii M. Papa in capsa reconditum reperit caput, in quo et pictacium invenit pariter litteris exaratum græcis, ipsum esse significantes." *L. P., ib.* The diaconal Church of St. George in Velabro was the titular church of our great Cardinal Newman, who was a cardinal deacon.

[3] *Cf.* Gregorov., i. p. 48 and p. 81. On the later page Gregorovius says that the second ecclesiastical region covered, roughly speaking, the second and eighth imperial regions. From the above extract it is perfectly plain that at least a part of the tenth imperial region was also included in the second ecclesiastical region. *Vide sup.*, Pt. I. p. 42 n.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Copronymus. These monks were very naturally chosen by Zachary, as St. George was one of the chief patron saints of the Greeks. Various inscriptions, still to be seen in this old basilica of St. George, recall the memory of the Greek *Egumeni* (abbots), who in the eighth and ninth centuries had charge of the church.[1]

To go further into Zachary's work in the direction of Church restoration and decoration would be to trench on the office of the archæologist and the antiquarian. Referring, therefore, our readers to the *Book of the Popes*, and the learned comments of Bartolini,[2] it will be worth while to add a word or two on his efforts as a landlord to improve the cultivation of the Roman Campagna.

Domus cultæ.

The Campagna, a low-lying plain round Rome, some ninety miles in length and some thirty, from the sea to the Sabine and Alban hills, in breadth, was never at the best of times a very healthy district. But at the period of which we are now writing, what with the devastations of the Huns and other barbarians, who broke up the Roman empire and sacked its capital, what with the wars of Belisarius and Narses for the recovery of Italy from the barbarian Goth, and the various attacks on Rome by the Lombards, the state of the Campagna was rapidly approaching that desolate and disease-producing condition in which we see it to-day. Zachary, however, profiting by a year or two of peace, turned his attention to promote measures that might effect something in the way of retarding the destruction of the fertility of the Campagna, which he saw was but too rapidly going on. He accordingly established agricultural colonies—known as 'domus cultæ'—at suitable places. Dwellings and oratories

[1] *Cf.* Bartolini, p. 419 f., on St. George, and the history of the basilica of this name *in Velabro*, etc.

[2] P. 557 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

or small churches were provided; and every effort was made by the Pope to induce men to settle there, and to procure by purchase sufficient land in their neighbourhood to give the colonists plenty of employment. The *Liber Pontificalis* gives us the names of five such colonies. One that went by the name of St. Cecily[1] was situated five miles from Rome on the Tiburtine road, and was incorporated with the Tiburtine 'patrimony,' which included all the country between the Via Prænestina and the Tiber. A second was founded some fourteen miles from Rome in the Etruscan patrimony that stretched along the right bank of the Tiber. This 'colony' lay between the Claudian and Cornelian roads. Laurentum, now Capocotta, was the third; and Antius and Formia, in the old Volscian territory, constituted the fourth and fifth. When the work of founding these agricultural colonies was accomplished, Zachary summoned a synod of the clergy of the Roman Church, declared before it that he had added the said colonies to the patrimonies and dominion of St. Peter, and forbade their alienation by any of his successors or by any other person whatsoever.[2]

Zachary and the Franks.

Of the regular intercourse which Zachary maintained with the Franks, very little has come down to us. The

[1] "Qua domus culta, S. Ceciliæ usque in hodiernum diem vocatur." *L. P.* It may be again noted that a 'patrimony' consisted of a number of 'massæ,' and that each 'massa' was in turn a collection of a number of farms; was an estate in other words. *Cf. L. P.*, and Bartolini, p. 539 f.; Gregorovius, ii. 270.

[2] *L. P.* Some extracts from the 'registers' of Zachary have been preserved, which show at what rent and to whom he leased some of the estates of the Church. *Cf.* Bartolini, 551 f., and Jaffé, *Regest.*, No. 1760–1765, 1st ed. The extracts were preserved in an abstract of Gregory II., and Zachary's, etc., registers made by Cardinal Deusdedit in the eleventh century. It should be stated that the sites above assigned to the domus cultæ are not altogether free from doubt.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Caroline Code has preserved only one of his letters, addressed to "the most excellent and most Christian Pippin, Major Domus, to all our most beloved bishops and religious abbots, and to all the God-fearing princes of the Franks." This document furnishes a series of replies to questions on various points of the canon and moral laws, sent to him for solution by Pippin, acting on the advice of Frankish bishops. The Pope gives his answers in accordance with the tradition of the Fathers, the authority of the canons, and his own decrees, which he has issued by his apostolical power.[1] Further, the letters of St. Boniface reveal the fact that Zachary vigorously co-operated with that great apostle of the Germans by securing for him the active support of the Franks. And lastly, a letter already alluded to, a letter of which the authenticity has been questioned on seemingly insufficient grounds, shows him in that rôle of peace-maker which he knew so well how to play. The brothers Pippin and Carlomann lived on the best of terms after the death of their father Charles Martel. But this was not the case with their half-brother Grifo, the son, whether legitimate or otherwise is not known, of Charles Martel and the Bavarian princess Swanahild. Whether Grifo was dissatisfied with the share of power left to him by his father, or whether the two brothers were jealous of what had been done for Grifo, certain it is that war ere long broke out between the latter and his half-brothers. Grifo was soon subdued and imprisoned (741). When Carlomann renounced the world, Pippin released Grifo (747). It was kindness thrown away. Grifo was soon in arms again. And once more did the sword fail him. It was at this juncture that the Pope intervened (750–1)

[1] Ep. 3 *G.* We have replied in accordance with "quod Deo inspirante apostolica auctoritate decernere potuimus (etiam et nos)."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

He implored the clergy to add their efforts for peace[1] to those which were being made by the monks whom Optatus, the abbot of Monte Cassino, and his princely subject, Carlomann, had sent to the court of the Major Domus, Pippin. It is, to say the least, likely enough that this mediation saved Grifo. Yet once more was he forgiven by the generous Pippin. But Grifo was impervious to kindness, and it was while scheming with Pippin's foes, Tassilo of Bavaria, and Aistulf, the king of the Lombards, that he was slain by some of Pippin's followers (753).

Though the authority is anything but contemporary, the *Annals* of Metz (not written till towards the close of the tenth century) are probably but relating a fact when they tell of a rebellion of Otilo (the predecessor of Tassilo III.), against Pippin. The Bavarian dukes were ever chafing against the yoke of the Franks, and consequently they were frequently in arms against them. They were invariably worsted. And so on the banks of the Lech, Otilo was defeated by Pippin and Carlomann in 743. In the fight there was captured on the side of Otilo the priest Sergius, the missus of Pope Zachary. The same authority says that on the day before the battle he had been sent by Otilo to the Franks, and, pretending to speak[2] in the name of the Pope, had forbidden the battle and ordered the Franks to depart from Bavaria. When Sergius fell into the hands of Pippin and his brother, they took good care to impress upon him that he could not have been speaking in St. Peter's name, because it was by the intercession of Blessed Peter and the just

[1] Ep. Zach., ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 467. "Ut ad pacis concordiam redeant, vobis (episcopis) propter Deum pacifice mediantibus."

[2] "Falsoque ex auctoritate D. Apostolici bellum interdixerat." *Ann. Mettenses*, an. 743, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

judgment of God that they had been victorious, and that "Bavaria and the Bavarians were to belong to the empire of the Franks!" We may conclude that the *Annals* had no authority for much more than the fact of the Pope's attempted mediation between the combatants.

Zachary authorises the deposition of Childeric (or Hilderic) III., 752.

But, the most important of Pope Zachary's relations with the Franks,—indeed, one of the most memorable events in the history of the popes of the Middle Ages up to this date—was his decision with regard to the election of Pippin to the throne of the Frankish empire in place of Childeric. No action of the mediæval popes up to this period has been more discussed or more variously viewed. While some writers would condemn the conduct of the Pope, others would approve of it; and there are those who would minimise and those who would perhaps magnify its importance. Before entering upon the details of the matter, there are one or two points which unquestionably stand out from the historical documents of the period. The number of writers who speak of it—both at the time and in the years more immediately following the event—shows unmistakably that the affair was then regarded as one of no mean importance; and the way in which it is spoken of by these writers shows that the appeal to the Pope and his judgment on the matter were looked on at the time as *most natural*. This is a very important point to bear in mind, first because many are apt to judge of the doings of men in the past by the different laws and the different recognised criteria of judgment of the present day; and again because we have not such a deep knowledge of the facts of the case as to warrant us in forming a different judgment on it to that formed by the historians and men of the time.

What are the facts of the case as they have come down to us, it will be our task now to set forth with but as little admixture of comment of our own as need be. The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

later descendants[1] of the kings of the Merovingian race were men practically without vigour of mind or body. All real power slipped or was plucked from their feeble grasp. While they were once a year saluted as kings, throughout all the year the so-called mayors of the palace were looked up to as kings, and had in reality all the power of kings.

Originally only 'masters of the household,' they were, at the time of which we are now speaking, the chief ministers of the kingdom, and had control over the chief departments of the State. Such an important place did they occupy that even before the declaration of Pope Zachary we sometimes find them spoken of simply as kings. And so Desiderius, Bishop of Cahors, addresses (*c.* 650, ep. i. 6) Grimoald, the son of Pippin 'of Landen,' and mayor of the palace in the kingdom of Austrasia, as "the ruler not only of the royal court but of the kingdom"—*totius aulæ immoquæ regni rectorem.*

The nominal king of the Franks in the year 752 was Childeric III., one of the weakest of the weak. He is described as a man of 'not the slightest account,'[2] 'of no sense,'[3] 'as useless and good for nothing.'[4] It does not require any deep political insight to see that such a condition of things was to the last degree dangerous to a State. And the danger was intensified at this period

[1] Reges "Francorum qui ex stirpe regia erant, et reges appellabantur, ... potestatem vero regiam penitus nullam habebant, sed quod Major domus Francorum volebat, hoc faciebant" is the language of the contemporary *Annales Lauris. minor.*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i. To the same effect speak the *Annales Lauris. and Fuld.*; Regino in his *Chronicle* (all ap. Pertz, *ib.*); and especially Eginhard in his *Life of Charlemagne*, c. 4 (Eng. trans., p. 26).

[2] "Hildericus levis nimis" (*Annal. Quedlinburg.*, ap. Pertz, iii.).

[3] "Insensatus" (Ademar, *Hist.*, ii.; *ib.*, iv.).

[4] "Vir inutilis ac remissus, ... et ineptus." Ugo of Fleury *Hist.*, *ib.*, ix.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by the rebellions of Grifo,[1] Pippin's half-brother. Among the Franks, as among the Anglo-Saxons, the monarchy was at least so far elective that it lay with the nobles to choose their kings from amongst the various members of the royal family. And the records of both peoples show that the eldest sons did not always succeed to their fathers' thrones. Matters had now come to such a pass with the Merovingian race, from a continued succession of mere boys, that there does not appear to have been at the time of Childeric III. any member of that family worthy of holding the kingly power, at any rate in comparison with such 'mayors of the palace' as Charles Martel and Pippin the Short. Consequently the chief men of the Franks, both cleric and lay, felt that the interests of their country imperatively demanded a change. There can be no difficulty in believing that Pippin helped on their deliberations, and named himself as the most fitting man both to be and to be called king.[2] But it is equally clear, from the quiet way in which the resolution that actually made him king was accomplished, that his pretensions were regarded as just by the nobles at large. However, though themselves convinced that it was within their power and right for sufficient reason to depose one sovereign and replace him by another, they were men of sense, and understood well enough that their contemplated action might form a dangerous precedent. And so, knowing that no one is a judge in his own case, and that they might be deceived in supposing they had reason enough to dethrone Childeric, they resolved to get the opinion and decision of another on the

[1] *Cf. Ann. Metens.*; Hodgkin, *Italy*, vii. 96, 120.

[2] "Pepin inheriting his father Charles Martel's talents and *ambition*, made, in the name, and with the consent of the nation, a solemn reference to Pope Zacharias, as to the deposition of Childeric III." (Hallam, *Europe during the Middle Ages*, 4th ed., p. 12.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

merits of their proposed conduct. To whom, then, could they turn more naturally on this, which was as much a question of morals as of politics, than to the Pope, to whom they looked up not only as the author of their Christianity, but as the representative of Our Lord on earth, and so the chief pastor of all Christians?

Arguing from the fact that one of those sent by Pippin to consult Zachary on his wishes was Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, one of St. Boniface's friends, that according to many ancient authors, Boniface anointed Pippin as king, and that in 751 Boniface sent[1] Lul to Rome to discuss some secret matters with the Pope, not a few authors think it by no means improbable that St. Boniface was the chief of Pippin's supporters and advisers in the contemplated revolution. However that may be, it is certain that there went to Rome (probably at the close of the year 751) two ambassadors from Pippin, and 'the whole nobility of the Franks,'[2] viz., Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, and Fulrad, Pippin's chaplain, charged to ask the Pope whether it was a desirable state of things that there should be in France men who with the name of king had no regal power. To this Zachary gave an authoritative reply that it was better, under the circumstances, that he should be and should be called king who had the power of a king rather than the one who had the name without the substance

[1] Bonif., ep. 141, ed. *S.*; ep. 86 *D.* "Habet (Lul) *secreta* quædam mea, quæ soli pietati vestræ profiteri debet." Zachary, in his answer, Nov. 4, 751, says he has in return given both verbal and written answers. "De quibus *tam in verbo* responsum dantes, et per scripta tuæ remisimus fraternitati," 142 *S.*; 87 *D.*

[2] "Una cum consilio et consensu omnium Francorum"—from an addition to the Chronicle of *Fredegard* (a work written in the days of Pippin), found by Cardinal Bartolini (pp. 506–7) in a Vatican MS. known as Cod. No. 213 of Queen Christina of Sweden.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of a king. Accordingly, "that the good order[1] of the Christian world might not be disturbed," he "ordered by his apostolic[2] authority that Pippin should be made king," and "that Archbishop Boniface should anoint him."[3] The decision of the Pope was followed by the public election of Pippin; and, raised on a shield amidst the applause of his cheering comrades, he was by them hailed as king, after in a most solemn manner he had been anointed king at Soissons by Boniface and other assistant bishops (752). As will be noticed in its proper place, Pippin was again anointed (754) by Pope Stephen (II.) III. Childeric was tonsured and shut up in the monastery of St. Bertin in Sithiu, founded by St. Omer (or Audomar). His wife and son were also enclosed in convents.

A word on the authorities for the action of Zachary.

As the history of this appeal is so important, our readers might perchance care to know a little more about the authorities on which it rests than can be gathered from the preceding notes. Besides the testimony of the so-called *Annales minores*[4] of Lauresheim, which chronicle the events between the years 741 and 788, there are those of the *Annals*[5] *of Lauresheim*, and those, so-called, of Eginhard.[6] Concerning these two latter, the illustrious Pertz gives[7] it as his opinion that the annals of Lauresheim were composed in the monastery of Nazarius, and only reached down to the year 788; that they afterwards came into the hands of Eginhard, the biographer of Charlemagne, who continued them to the year 829; and

[1] "Ne perturbaretur Christianitatis ordo," Regino, *Chron.*, ad an. 749, ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i.: "ut non conturbaretur ordo," *Annal. Lauris.*, ad an. 749, *ib.*

[2] "Zacharias . . . . per auctoritatem Apostolicam *jussit* Pipinum regem fieri," *Annal. Lauris.*, *ubi sup.*

[3] "A Sancto Bonifacio Archiepiscopo Moguntino *jussu* præfati Papæ in Regem inungitur," from a document also found in the above codex. Ap. Bartolini, p. 507.

[4] Ap. Pertz, *M. G. H.*, i. [5] *Ib.* [6] *Ib.* [7] *Ib.*, p. 127.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that finally, after the earlier part, the work of the monks, had received some emendations from him, the whole chronicle (741–829), with a few slight changes in his continuation, was edited as the *Annals of Eginhard*. The evidence of these contemporary chronicles is supported by a host[1] of others, and is if possible excelled by one or two other documents now to be adduced. In an old MS. codex, containing the works of St. Gregory of Tours, *De vitis patrum* and *De gloria confessorum*, found in the abbey of St. Denis, near Paris, there was discovered, in the same characters, and written with the same ink[2] as the rest of the MS., the following interesting note by the scribe who wrote the MS:—"If, reader, you would care to know when this work in praise of the holy martyrs was written, it was in the year of Our Lord 767, during the sixteenth year of the reign of the most happy, peaceful, and Catholic Pippin, king of the Franks, and patrician of the Romans, in the fifth indiction. . . . The aforesaid most flourishing Lord Pippin, Pious King, was raised to the regal throne by the authority and command (*imperium*) of the Lord Pope Zachary of holy memory, by the anointing with the sacred chrism at the hands of the holy bishops of Gaul and by the election of all the Franks three years before."[3] As Bartolini takes notice,[4] the

[1] Ap. Bartolini, pp. 449–462, 496–529; Jungmann, *Dissert. in H. E.*, xiv. In all these chronicles the authoritative action of the Pope is brought out with every variety of expression—mandavit, data auctoritate sua, jussit, decreto, per auctoritatem apostolicam, etc.

[2] A very important point in determining the authenticity of MSS. *Cf.* the *Chronology of Inks*, an interesting little article in the *Bessarione*, No. 1, May 1896. This is a small periodical issued at Rome and Siena on Oriental studies.

[3] This note was originally edited by Papebrock and Henschenius, the Bollandists (*Exeg. Prælim. A. SS.*, tom. iii. Martii, p. xxii), then by Mabillon, *De re diplomat.*, v. 354; *L. P.*, i. 458; *M. G. SS.*, xv. p. 1. It is often spoken of as the *clausula Pippini*.

[4] P. 506.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

epithets, 'most flourishing, etc,' give us internal evidence that the scribe was contemporary with Pippin, as does also the title 'Lord' (*Domnus*) applied to Zachary, for it shows that that Pope must have been but comparatively recently dead. Another contemporary writer, cited by the above-named distinguished author from an inedited Vatican MS. (Reg. Sueciæ,[1] No. 213), speaks quite to the same effect when he says,[2] that with the advice and consent of all the Franks an embassy was sent to Rome; and that on the receipt of the apostolic mandate Pippin was raised to the throne according to the ancient rite, by the election of the Franks, the consecration of the bishops, and the homage (*subjectio*) of the nobles (*principes*).

From the contemporary authorities, which the reader now has before him, he can have no difficulty in concluding that the Pope intervened actively in Pippin's elevation, and that, as results showed, his intervention was most salutary. An important revolution of the greatest benefit for Church and State was thus brought about without the slightest disorder. A strong government was established, under which civilisation, which, if true, means improvement in the welfare of the people from all points of view, made considerable progress in Western Europe. Only sticklers for "the right divine of kings to govern wrong" (which right, we believe, in the eyes of sound thinking men, does not exist) could object to Zachary's decision, a decision the lawfulness of which was not called in question by any of his contemporaries! Well

[1] A short life of this illustrious convert and extraordinary woman, whose collection of MSS. made such a splendid addition to the Vatican library, was published by Richardson of London (1862), under the title of *Christina, Queen of Sweden, a brief notice of her life, conversion and death*, by M. T.

[2] This and another extract from the same codex from Bartolini, p. 507.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

would it be for modern Europe if its rulers would refer their differences or their difficulties to the popes once again![1] Their disagreements would lead to much less fatal results!

Zachary issues decisions with regard to spiritual relationship, and for confining bishops to their own dioceses, 750–752.

Not much remains to be told of the doings of this great Greek pontiff. In reply[2] to a letter of Theodore, Bishop of Pavia, he forbids a son to marry a girl to whom his father has stood as godparent, a decision that was inserted among the decretals on the subjects of spiritual relationship, and was consequently the law of the Church for a long time. By the Council of Trent, however, spiritual relationship was limited to the first degree—*i.e.*, to the godparents themselves and to their godchildren and their godchildren's natural parents, as well as to the baptiser, the baptised, and the parents of the baptised.

Zealous for the preservation of order, we find Zachary in the last year of his life condemning[3] Ausfred, Bishop of Siena, for presuming to consecrate an altar in the Church of St. Ampsanus against the wishes of the Bishop of Arezzo, under whose jurisdiction the said church was. The bishops of Siena, however, as the Church was within the limits of their diocese, thought that sufficient attention had not been paid to their side of the question. The case cropped up again at intervals even till the beginning of the eleventh century (1029).

The Pope's charity.

In the midst of all the weighty matters of Church and State in which Zachary was ever immersed, to the great profit of both, he found time, like his great model the first

[1] Would that the example of Prince Bismarck in referring to Leo XIII. his dispute with the Spanish government relative to the Philippine Islands were to be universally followed!

[2] The text of the letter in Bartolini, p. (77); in Italian, p. 412. Mansi, xii.

[3] This we learn from a bull of Pope Stephen (II.) III., ap. Bartolini, p. (86).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Gregory, for deeds of charity and for literary pursuits. Not only did he cause food from his own table to be taken by the masters of his household (*paracellarii*) to the poor and pilgrims who dwelt in the hospitals in the neighbourhood of St. Peter's, but looked after the poor and sick of the whole city.[1] And like a true bishop he showed in a most substantial way that he had a genuine love of his clergy; was, indeed, their father. Justly regarding it as an important point that the clergy should be in such a position as to appear respectable in the eyes of everyone, he more than doubled the donative (*roga* or *presbyterium*) which the popes were wont to bestow on the Roman clergy once a year, in addition to the regular revenues they derived from the property belonging to the Church (*titulus*) to which they were attached. This was called 'one donative' (*roga una*), because, as Bartolini observes,[2] it was granted once a year. His biographer might well say[3] of Zachary that he would not suffer anyone to be in distress.

Translates the *Dialogues* of St. Gregory I.

In the department of literature we know[4] that he translated the *Dialogues* of St. Gregory I. into Greek, and we have the authority of the heresiarch Photius that,[5] to the general gain, he translated many other of his works in addition.

Death of Zachary, March 752.

Zachary, the great and good, went the way of all flesh,

[1] "Necnon ut omnibus et inopibus et infirmis, per universas regiones istius Romanæ Urbis constitutis, curiose distribuerentur" — statuit alimentorum sumptus. *L. P.*

[2] P. 562. The cardinal naïvely contrasts the inferior revenues of the cardinal priests of to-day with those of the same dignitaries of the eighth century, and supposes that the distribution of medals on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul has now to serve them as a roga!

[3] "Omnes utpote pater . . . . amplectens . . . . et quempiam tribulari minime permittens." *L. P.*

[4] *L. P.*, and John the Deacon, in vit., iv. 75.

[5] *Bib. cod.* 252, cited by Bartolini.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

March 14 or 22, 752, and was buried in St. Peter's the following day. His name is to be found inscribed among the saints in the earliest martyrologies that are extant, written after his death, such as those of Ado and Usuard. In the Roman martyrology he is commemorated on March 15.

Zachary coins money.

To serve as a natural introduction to a few words on the temporal power of the popes at this period, mention of one act of Zachary has been hitherto delayed. The act referred to is the fact of his having issued money bearing his own name.

After the Romans threw off their allegiance to the emperor Leo in the reign of Pope Gregory II., it is only natural to conclude that the need for new coins would have to be met, as of course the supply from the mints of Constantinople would cease. The need for coins of small value would probably be the first felt. The smaller coins would be the ones in the most constant use—for the Rome of this age especially must have been a city of poor—and consequently from this cause, and from the very fact of their small value, would be soonest lost. Though there is extant[1] a silver coin that bears no name, and which *may* belong to an issue of St. Gregory II., small square bronze coins of Gregory III.[2] are, as far as we know, the first that were struck by order of a Pope. The coins that we have of Pope Zachary are also small, square

[1] *Cf. Studi Storici intorno ad alcune prime monete Papali*, by Pizzamiglio, Rome, 1876, p. 23 f. An engraving of the coin referred to will be found at the end of the *Studi*, etc.

[2] *Cf.* Bartolini, p. 62 f.; Pizzamiglio, p. 26 f.; and *Le monete dei Papi*, by Cinagli, p. 1. Plates of the coins of Gregory III. and Zachary are given by all these writers. Pizzamiglio, following the distinguished numismatist D. Promis, notes (p. 6) that from the Middle Ages to the days of its last issue in our own times the papal coinage was the finest in Italy. And that on many counts, viz., the centuries during which it has been minted, its numbers, the history and antiquities it illustrates, and its beauty, as well from the excellence and variety of the dies from which it has been struck as from the elegance of its legends.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and bronze; for a silver coin that is shown bearing the name of Zachary is acknowledged on all hands to be spurious. On the obverse of the coins of Zachary, enclosed in a circlet of raised dots, and with an initial cross, we have the letters ZACCHARIAE, and on the reverse, with the same circlet and cross, the letters PAPAE. These coins, both of Gregory III. and Zachary, are in the Kircherian Museum at Rome. According to Cinagli, the coin of Zachary there preserved weighs 27·51 Roman grammes, or 1·35 French.

Since writing the above, a visit to Rome has furnished facts which render necessary a modification of the preceding paragraph. There are no longer any papal coins in the Kircherian Museum. When the Italian government seized the Gregorian University buildings, in which was the Museum founded by the Jesuit, Father Kircher—an act of robbery with violence which is glossed over by saying that the buildings were made *national property*—the papal coins which used to be there were transferred to the Museo delle Terme. But the *coins* of Gregory III., etc., are not forthcoming. It may be that after the confusion caused by transportation has been remedied they will be found. As it is, however, the obliging director of the Museum, Cavaliere Pasqui, informed us that at present the *national* collection of papal coins does not go further back than Gregory IV.

Specimens of the said *coins* were, however, seen by us in the Vatican collection of papal coins, which, through the great kindness of Signor Serafini, who is the director as well of the Vatican collection of coins as of the Municipal, we were able to examine. Through the recent purchase of the collection of Cardinal Randi, the Vatican has now the finest collection of papal coins in the world. It is composed of over 30,000 specimens, of which

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

16,000[1] are different. Whatever may be thought of the *coins* of the popes before Hadrian I., the series of papal coins unquestionably begins with him and goes down till towards the middle of the twelfth century. Coins of Pascal II. (1099–1118) exist in the Vatican and elsewhere. Then, for about a century and a half, money in Rome was struck by the *Senate*. During that period, though at the height of their power abroad, the popes had not much of it at home. From Blessed Benedict XI. (1303–5) to our own times (Pius IX.) there is an unbroken series of papal money. The *Senate* (1252) were the first to strike money in gold. They also coined in silver, copper and in some alloy. The papal coins, however, from Hadrian I. to Pascal II. are all in silver[2]; and so, as the *coins* of Gregory III. and Zachary are of copper, and for the most part square, Promis and Serafini, whose opinion is entitled to very great respect, believe that they are only *tesseræ*, and were used for the same purposes as our soup-tickets. Still, the appearance of such pieces of stamped metal for the first time, just when political considerations would lead one to expect to find traces of a papal coinage, is so striking that we cannot but subscribe to the view of Pizzamiglio,[3] and maintain that they are the first essays of the popes in the direction of coining money. Even if they are regarded as *tesseræ*, they must be considered as having the relation to money that bank notes have.

[1] Cinagli (*Monete dei Papi*) only notices 8000 specimens. To repeat with Promis (*Monete dei R. P.*, p. 5), the collection of papal coins constitutes "la più ricca e bella serie di monete che vanti l'Europa."

[2] The Lower, or Later-Roman Empire issued very few copper coins. See the carefully executed work of Hill, *Greek and Roman Coins*. Macmillan, 1902.

[3] He refutes the arguments of Promis, p. 28 f. Among other points, Pizzamiglio shows that the square shape of the *coins* of Gregory, etc., is to be seen in other monies of the period, and that money of that shape is noticed in the Code of Justinian. *Cf. Nov. constit.*, Nov. 105, c. 2, n. 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Now if there is one thing that history makes clear, it is that whoso coins the money in a State holds, practically at least, the supreme power in that State. A prince always justly considered himself as practically independent of any central government if he issued his own money; and, on the other hand, it has ever been the aim of such as have wished to extend their sway to reserve to themselves the sole right of coining money throughout the territories they wished to claim as theirs. The fact, then, that Gregory III. and Zachary issued a coinage of their own, shows us that at this point in the eighth century the civil rulers of the city of Rome were the popes and not the emperors; for it has never been contended that any special permit to coin money was given them by the rulers at Constantinople.

The temporal power of the popes.

So much passion and prejudice is generally brought to bear on this subject of the temporal power of the popes, that it behoves us to approach it with the greatest circumspection. Some half century ago the non-Catholic writers of the *Cabinet Cyclopedia of History* did not hesitate to declare[1] that "modern writers especially, speaking of the Papacy, had almost always aimed at perverting the truth of history, and that in no country under heaven has this abominable dishonesty been so prevalent as in England." Though, with the rapid publication of original documents that has of late years gone on in the more advanced nations of Europe, and with much greater and deeper attention on the part of the 'many' to historical studies, this damning charge stands in need of some modification, there is still much truth in it. And even yet many writers cannot bring themselves to speak on the popes, and especially on their temporal power, in accordance with a fair temperate deduction from historical facts.

[1] *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, i. 147, ed. Cabinet Cyc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In considering this question of the temporal power of the popes, it may be well first again to emphasise the facts of the case and then to enquire into their causes. As a matter of *fact*, then, there can be no doubt that from the days of Gregory II. Rome was to all intents and purposes independent of the emperors and subject to the popes. On this point of fact there is abundance of non-Catholic testimony. Though the supremacy of the Eastern Empire was still recognised, says Finlay,[1] "from this time, A.D. 733, the city of Rome enjoyed political independence under the guidance and protection of the popes."

There is by no means so much agreement as to the cause or causes that brought about this temporal sway of the popes over the Roman duchy. Many non-Catholic writers ascribe it to the bad ambition of the popes themselves in this age. At this conclusion they can but arrive

[1] *History of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 50; Hallam, *Europe during the Middle Ages*, p. 15, note 2. "There can be no question that a considerable share of jurisdiction and authority was practically exercised by the popes during this period." Even Proctor (*History of Italy*, p. 11) says the "controversy on image worship gave the next great impulse to the grandeur of the popedom, and gifted it with independent temporal authority over the city of Rome." Another writer says the same: "For it was in revolt against his (Leo's) tyranny that the Roman people voluntarily submitted to become subjects of the Holy See" (*A Hist. of Med. Christianity in Italy*, by C. J. Hemans, p. 2). Hear Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, iii. c. 49, pp. 362–3: "The liberty of Rome, which had been oppressed by the arms and arts of Augustus, was rescued, after 750 years of servitude, from the persecution of Leo the Isaurian. . . . His (the Pope's) alms, his sermons, his correspondence with the kings and prelates of the West, his recent services, their gratitude, an oath, accustomed the Romans to consider him as the first magistrate or *prince* of the city. . . . Their temporal dominion is now confirmed by the reverence of a thousand years, and their noblest title is the free choice of a people whom they had redeemed from slavery!" "Henceforth," says Milman (*Hist. of Lat. Christ.*, ii. p. 431), not very clearly it must be confessed, "the Pope, if not yet a temporal sovereign, is a temporal potentate." *Cf.* Gregorovius (*Hist. of City of Rome*, ii. 246) on Greg. III., cited above; James, *Life of Charlemagne*, p. 72, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by imputing evil motives (knowledge of which they can only draw from their imaginations) to acts which, simply considered as history presents them, are quite innocent. But anyone who may have taken the trouble to read the preceding pages will, we imagine, have seen for himself that practically independent temporal power did not come to the popes all at once in the eighth century, but that civil authority gradually accumulated in their hands from the days of Pope Gregory I.; and, as will be shown presently, long before his time. It will, doubtless, have been observed how, from the unwillingness or incapability of others, it naturally fell to the popes to take measures for the defence of the Roman duchy, and how in time, equally naturally, the people of Rome at last came to recognise only those as their rulers who had proved themselves their sole preservers. We say it fell naturally to the popes, inasmuch as they were the most distinguished men in Rome, as well from the material resources at their command, as, of course, still more from the regard had by the people to their spiritual power.[1] On the other hand, if the power of the Eastern emperors had been greater, had they honestly done their best for their Italian provinces, instead of endeavouring to use them merely as a means to raise money, or as an area through which their dogmatic

[1] Non-Catholic writers do not hesitate to declare that the bishop of Rome was, as early as the second century, acknowledged as Head of the Church Universal, and contend that "this fact cannot be controverted; it has been acknowledged from the time of Irenæus and Cyprian, whose works contain abundant evidence of the spiritual supremacy of the popes" (*Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 143, ed. *Cabinet Cyclop.*). Writing of the beginning of the eighth century, Finlay, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 46, says: "The Pope of Rome had long been regarded by orthodox Christians as the head of the Church; even the Greeks admitted his right of inspection over the whole body of the clergy, in virtue of the superior dignity of the Roman See." For this last statement he quotes Sozomen (*H. E.*, iii. 8), a writer of the fifth century.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

edicts had to be propagated, there would, humanly speaking, have been no independent temporal power in the hands of the popes. For certainly the popes never tried to throw off the yoke of the Eastern Empire.

Gradual growth of the 'temporal power' of the popes.

It has just been said that temporal power began to be exercised by the popes even long before the days of Gregory the Great. From the earliest times, the popes had that at least indirect temporal power which the possession and free use of wealth give to its owners in every civilised land. Of the early wealth of the popes, Eusebius has preserved evidence enough. The letter[1] of St. Dionysius of Corinth to Pope Soter (175–182) tells of the previous generosity of the Roman Church being outdone by Soter, who "furnished great supplies to all the saints"; and Eusebius adds that the liberality of the Church of Rome was continued to his time (fourth century). The wealth of the Roman Church, which enabled its bishops to be so liberal, was largely increased by Constantine[2] and others after Christianity had overthrown paganism in the Roman world. So that by the time of Gregory the Great, the bishop of Rome had landed property (known as the patrimonies of St. Peter) in every province of the empire. And long before his time, the wealth of the bishop of Rome had furnished the pagan with subject matter for pleasant raillery or bitter sneer, as the case might be.[3]

[1] *Hist. Eccles.*, iv. 23. *Cf.* vii. 5, where Dionysius of Alexandria (248–265) speaks of Pope Stephen supplying with necessaries at different times *all* the provinces of Syria and Arabia.

[2] *Cf. L. P.* in vit. S. Silvest.

[3] For the one case we have the well-known jocose remark of the Consul Prætextatus to Pope Damasus ('ludens b. papæ Damaso'): "Make me bishop of Rome and I will be a Christian to-morrow" (St. Jerome, Ep. 38 (al. 61), *ad Pammach.*); for the other the equally famous attack of the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus (fourth century) on the popes of his time, whom he represents as enriched by the offerings

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

After the conversion of Constantine, the popes had not only that influence in temporal matters that follows wealth and station, they had the direct power in civil affairs that was given to all Christian bishops by the laws of the empire. Constantine bestowed on all bishops considerable judicial power. "He permitted," says Sozomen,[1] a lawyer of Constantinople who wrote about the middle of the fifth century, "all who had law-suits to decline the jurisdiction of the civil magistrates and to appeal to the judgment of the bishops; he even ordered that the sentence of the ecclesiastical tribunal should be more binding than that of secular judges, that they should have the same authority as those given by the emperor himself; finally, that the governors of provinces and their officers should be obliged to enforce their execution." Though part of these powers was somewhat restricted by some of the successors of Constantine, still, in what may be called the final expression of Roman law, the Code of Justinian, the powers given to bishops in civil affairs are both numerous and important. A glance at the first book of the Code will convince anyone that there is no exaggeration in this statement. The bishops had not only to watch over the interests of youths, women, slaves, orphans, prisoners and poor,[2] and to aid the magistrates to suppress gambling,[3] but to take their share in seeing to the defence and other interests[4] of the cities—such as

of Roman matrons, driving about magnificently dressed and keeping a table that surpassed the emperor's.

[1] *H. E.*, i. 9, cited by Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope*, i. 153.

[2] Cod. Justin., l. i. tit. iv. n. 1, 12, 14, 22–24, 30, 33.

[3] *Ib.*, n. 25.

[4] *Ib.*, n. 8, 26, and Novel. 128, c. xv. Many of these enactments are cited at length by Gosselin, § 103 f. *Cf.* the *Pragmatic Sanction* issued by Justinian in August 554 for the government of Italy. In the 19th section of this document, the emperor decrees that commercial transactions be regulated by "those weights

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the safe custody of the standard weights and measures —and, with the chief men in the different provinces, to select suitable persons for the purposes of local government. It is only to be expected, then, that if bishops in general had such powers, those of the great patriarchs of both East and West would be more extensive. To confine ourselves to the Western patriarchs, *i.e.*, to the Roman pontiffs, we have evidence of their great authority in temporals in the words[1] of Socrates, a lawyer of Constantinople, like Sozomen in the fifth century, who, if not a Novatian himself, was certainly a great admirer of that heresy and its votaries. Because the popes had taken measures to suppress the Novatians, Socrates seizes the occasion to rail at them for "going beyond the limits of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction," and for what he is pleased to call "degenerating into their present state of secular domination."

This 'secular domination,' which roused the wrath of Socrates, because he found it adverse to his pet sect, went on increasing, and was very largely exercised, as we have seen, by St. Gregory the Great; so much so that Dr. Hodgkin[2] notes that "the distance from the seat of empire, the interruption of communication with

and measures which our piety hath by these presents entrusted to the keeping of the most blessed Pope and the most ample Senate." *Cf.* § 12 for their rights in the election of the *judices*. *Cf.* Hodgkin, *Italy*, vi. 519 f.; Diehl, *Justinien* (Paris 1901), p. 202.

[1] *H. E.*, vii. 11. "Cum episcopatus Romanus . . . . ultra sacerdotii fines progressus jam olim in dominationem (ἐπὶ δυναστείαν) degenerasset."

[2] *Italy*, etc., v. 355. The Doctor might well have added the "indifference or incapability of the central government." As early as the days of Justin II., during the pontificate of Benedict I. (568), the Romans had been told by the emperor to see to their own safety (*cf.* Menander, *Excerpta*, p. 327, ed. Bonn), and the exarch had told Pelagius II. (577) that he could not protect the exarchate, much less Rome. *Cf.* Pelagius' letter to his apocrisiarius Gregory. Mansi, ix. 1889 (note in Jungmann, *Diss.*, xiv. p. 70).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Ravenna, the lordship of the vast patrimony of St. Peter, were all tending to turn the Pope, with his will or against his will, into a temporal sovereign." As time went on one act of jurisdiction after another was performed by Honorius, by Sisinnius, by Zachary; and, on the other hand, one act of rebellion after another against the emperors on the part of the Romans themselves under Constantine, and under Gregory II., forced the hands of the popes ever more and more. So that before the end of the first half of the eighth century the popes were independent rulers of the duchy of Rome. The stamping of his own name on the coins of the duchy by Zachary was but a legitimate consequence of the people of Rome refusing in the time of Pope Constantine to receive coins stamped with the name of the emperor Philippicus. This full independent civil power which accrued to the popes in the eighth century was a natural result of temporal authority wielded well and wisely for several centuries previously. It is but a physical law that everything that is well used grows. And notoriously, of all things, power increases as it moves forward. And, on the other hand, it is equally in accordance with nature that what is ill used should cease to grow, nay, should shrink. Nature and not ambition, then, is the key to the temporal power of the popes.

Men who are not Christians will, it may be presumed, accept the temporal power of the popes on what must be to them the sufficient ground that it was well gotten. But there are among those who profess that name, men who hold that, as Our Lord declared that "His kingdom was not of this world," it is not right for those who claim to be His vicars to hold the power of kings. Apart from the truth that Our Lord's kingdom, if not 'of,' *i.e.*, 'sprung from' this world, is certainly 'in'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

this world, we have it on the word of Our Lord that the children of the bridegroom were to do in His absence what they were not to do in His presence. And so, though the 'temporal power' cannot be said to be necessary in itself, for it was not much in evidence during the centuries of persecution, and is at present in abeyance, still 'temporal power' may be said to have become necessary with the rise of the Christian nations. It would not have been so, of course, with ideal Christian peoples. With human nature such as it is and always was, however, temporal power both was and is necessary to the popes if they are to be the common Fathers of all nations alike. A glance at the treatment meted out to them by the Byzantine emperors or other tyrants will show the absolute need the popes have of an independent temporal power to enable them fearlessly to proclaim the faith of Christ; as various non-Catholic writers[1] have admitted. Passing over the persecutions of Liberius, St. John I., Silverius, and Vigilius, as their names do not occur in this part of the history of the Papacy on which we are now engaged, we have seen St. Martin I. dragged off to exile and death, and Sergius, John VI., and Gregory II. only escaping a similar fate by the devotion of the people. And it may be added that the history of the popes of the tenth century, of those of Avignon and of Pius VII. in the hands of Napoleon, clearly points to the same moral. The Pope must be an independent ruler over some State that he may be truly free to administer the affairs of the Church in the best way. It is, then, obviously the duty of everyone who has at heart the

[1] *Cf.* Leibnitz, Hurter, etc., cited by the author of the *Temporal Power of the Pope*, i. 298. On this subject of the 'Temporal Power' of the popes, besides the able work just quoted, read De Maistre's clear and convincing book on *The Pope* (Eng. trans. by Dawson, Lond.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

true interests of the Church to do all that lies in his power that the ruffianly brigandage perpetrated in 1870, when in the name of 'Italian patriotism' Rome and the adjoining territory were wrested from their rightful owners the popes, may be undone. Italy lawfully belonging to Rome is the evidence of ancient history, but never has history shown us Rome lawfully belonging to the Italians. Mediæval and modern Rome have been made and preserved by the genius of the popes with the aid of the wealth of the Christian world. Rome, then, belongs to the popes; after them to the Christian world, particularly, perhaps, to the countries of Western Europe. Certainly not to the Italians alone, unless, forsooth, right and justice are to be gauged by geographical position. The sooner, then, Rome is restored to its proper owners the sooner will another great wrong be set right!

Summary on natural growth of temporal power.

To sum up what we have said. The foundation of the temporal power of the popes was their paramount spiritual authority. For there can be no doubt that, at least in the very earliest records that we have, in which the relative position of the great rulers in the Church is touched upon, the bishop of Rome is always set forth as the Head of the Church Catholic—whatever may have been the difference of opinion as to how far that headship extended. This, their spiritual position, naturally brought them wealth and station even during the era of the persecutions. With the triumph of the Church under Constantine, they shared in a pre-eminent degree the powers he gave to all bishops. With the transference of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, with the coming of the barbarians, the hold of the emperors on Italy and the West kept lessening, whereas the influence of the popes in Rome kept increasing the more that they were frequently its saviours. And with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the decay of the municipal system in the fourth century, the most important position in the great cities of the West was in the fifth century occupied by the bishops. Mr. Dill, while telling us[1] that "the municipal system, once the great glory of Roman organising power, had in the fourth century fallen almost to ruin," assures us that "the real leader of the municipal community in the fifth century, alike in temporal and in spiritual things, was often the great Churchman."[2]

In Rome and in Italy in the sixth century, even under the Ostrogoth, Arian though he generally was, considerable power was left in the hands of the Catholic bishops and the popes.[3] And when in the same century the Ostrogoth was crushed out of existence, and the 'Roman' empire once more asserted itself in Italy, the Pragmatic Sanction of Justinian did but put the popes on a higher pedestal of temporal power than ever. In 568 came the Lombards into Italy. From that the cause of the Roman empire in Italy was lost. *Sauve qui peut* was the only possibility. Preserving Rome from the ferocious Lombard, all power in it was forced into the hands of the popes. They had to take charge of its water and corn supply, to raise and pay troops, to repair its walls. And when, in return for saving Rome to the Empire, their persons were maltreated, and their faith outraged, the Roman people would endure the cupidity and weak tyranny of their emperors no longer. They threw off the yoke of the Greek, which oppressed them, and chose that of the Popes which was easy.

[1] *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 204.
[2] *Ib.*, 180.
[3] *Cf.* Hutton, *The Church of the Sixth Century*, pp. 30 f. and 96, a book in which, by the way, it is seemingly at least insinuated that the patriarch of Constantinople was the recognised head of the Church in the sixth century!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

STEPHEN II.

A.D. 752;

AND

STEPHEN (II). III.

A.D. 752–757.

Sources.—The life in the *L. P.* is full of minute details of Stephen III.'s dealings with the Lombards, and was perhaps written by one who went with that Pope into France. Indeed, the by no means unsparing use throughout the 'life' of such emphatic epithets as 'most wicked,' 'diabolical,' etc., applied to the Lombard king and his doings, seems enough of itself to show a Roman author who had felt the effects of his unscrupulous attacks on the devoted duchy. It is interesting, however, to note that there exists a MS. edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* containing this Pope's life, where these little-flattering epithets of the Lombard king are omitted, as also the pleasing ones applied to the Franks. Apparently in this MS. we have an edition prepared for Lombard use, and so, of course, drawn up before the fall of their kingdom in 774 (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. ccxxv). The last-named author reckons three editions of the biography of Stephen III.; and concludes that the interpolations in the original contemporary lives of the popes of the eighth century were introduced into them before the end of the same century. Gregorovius (*Rome*, ii. p. 273 note) has now at length no difficulty in admitting that "the *Liber Pontificalis* from this time onwards is fairly accurate and trustworthy!"

Some eight letters in the *Codex Carolinus* and extracts from

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

various Chronicles complete the authorities for the lives of Stephen II. and III.

Works.—Mr. Freeman, in *The Patriciate of Pippin* in Vol. IV., 1889, of the *English Historical Review*, holds that "when Pope Stephen III. bestowed the title of patrician of the Romans on Pippin, he did it by the authority of the reigning emperor Constantine Kopronymos." The evidence he adduces, however, seems scarcely adequate.

Emperor of the East.	Kings of the Lombards.	Exarch of Ravenna.
Constantine V. (Copronymus), 741–775.	Aistulf, 749–756. Desiderius, 756–774.	Eutychius, 727–752 (apparently the last of the exarchs).

Stephen II., 752 (March).

IMMEDIATELY after the death of Pope Zachary, 'the whole people' (*cunctus populus*) elected a certain priest Stephen as his successor. But after being formally inducted into the Lateran Palace, he was, on the morning of the third day after his election, stricken with apoplexy whilst in his chair transacting some of his domestic affairs.

His death.

Death[1] ensued on the following day. One consequence of the premature death of this Stephen before his consecration as bishop has been to cause great disorder in the numbers assigned to the different Stephens that have followed him. Thus a great many historians call the immediate successor of this unconsecrated Stephen, Stephen II., but as many more Stephen III. For ourselves we shall call the second Stephen, who succeeded Zachary, Stephen III., for two reasons. First, because we hold that election on the one hand and consent on the other are enough to make a Pope. From the time, at least, of St. Benedict II.,[2] the popes elect have exercised full

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Steph. III., and many of the annals, *e.g.*, *Annal. Nazar.* (ap. *M. G. H.*, i., ad an. 751), "Stephanus electus, tertia die percussus."

[2] *Cf. sup.*, p. 55.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

jurisdiction in the Church, and hence were acting as Heads of the Church as popes. And secondly, in the official list of the popes published yearly in Rome in the 'Diario' (Almanac), the number II. is affixed to the Stephen whose name is omitted by many in their lists of the popes; and as still further showing the tradition of the Roman Church, the portrait of the Stephen who reigned but for three days appears among the mosaic medallions of the Popes which adorn the basilica of St. Paul *outside-the-walls*.

In this same month of March, 'the whole people of God' assembled in the venerable basilica of St. Mary Major, and there, after pouring forth ardent prayers to God and Our Lady, unanimously elected another Stephen, a deacon. Amidst the greatest rejoicings, the newly-elected Pope was conveyed, first to the Lateran basilica, and then, 'according to custom,' to the adjoining palace.[1] He was consecrated on March 26; for we are told in the *Life* of Zachary, in the *Liber Pontificalis*, that the bishopric of Rome was vacant twelve days; and, as Stephen II. was never a bishop, we arrive at this date for the consecration of Stephen III.

Early life.

From a very early age Stephen was brought up in the Lateran Palace. On the death of his father, he was entrusted to the care of the popes, and thoroughly imbued with the doctrine and spirit of the apostles by the great pontiffs Gregory III. and Zachary.[2] Hence, in his pontificate he showed himself a lover of God's Church, a firm upholder of ecclesiastical tradition, a ready supporter of the poor of Christ, a constant preacher of God's word, and a bold defender of his flock.[3] His love for the poor Stephen

[1] *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.* Two deacons, Stephen and Paul, assisted at the council of 744. They were doubtless Stephen (II.) III. and his brother Paul I. They were ordained deacons by Zachary (*cf.* in vit. Zac.).

[3] *L. P.* Gregorovius only does him justice when he calls him an 'able man' (*Rome*, ii. p. 272). Kellet (*Pope Gregory*, p. 94), more

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

showed in a most practical manner. Four hospitals (*xenodochia*) within the city walls, which by the ravages of time had fallen into decay, he completely restored, enriched with presents and protected by a bull of interdict.[1] Another he re-established for daily supplying food to a hundred poor; and outside the city walls, on the Vatican hill, near St. Peter's, he built two new hospitals, and attached them to the already existing deaconries (*diaconiæ*) of Our Lady and St. Sylvester. That glorious title, 'lover of the poor,' the special appanage of the good Christian, was not given to Stephen in vain.

Stephen III. and the Lombards.

Under Pope Stephen there began in real earnest the last desperate attempt on the part of the Lombards to bring all Italy, the duchy of Rome included, under their barbaric sway. A contest which, after some twenty-two years' duration, was to end in the destruction of the Lombard kingdom, and leave the popes in peaceful rule over central Italy, was now begun between the popes, naturally and justly anxious to preserve the independence of the Roman duchy, and the Lombard kings bent on aggrandisement. Aistulf,[2] whom even Muratori, with his Lombard leanings, allows to have been a man of little conscience, and less judgment, attacked the territories still under the exarch with great vigour. His victorious troops overran Istria and the Pentapolis. Either in this year (752), or in the preceding,[3] Ravenna fell into his hands,

anxious for some petty antithesis than for truth, tells us that Stephen "was a man of very inferior mind to Zacharias, but by his *weakness* the union between Frankish king and Roman bishop, which the *strength* of his predecessor had so effectively promoted, was still further cemented."

[1] *L. P.* "Quæ (xenodochia) et per privilegii paginam sub anathematis interdicto confirmavit."

[2] *Annal.*, ad an. 755. "Astolfo . . . . uomo di poca coscienza, ed anche di men giudizio."

[3] A diploma found in the monastery of Farfa, and treated of by

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and thus, after some 180 years' duration, the power of the exarchs was broken for ever! Stephen heard with alarm that preparations were being made by Aistulf for the conquest of the Roman duchy. Whilst "his enemy was still afar off," the Pope, "in the third month after his consecration" (June 752), sent with presents to the king his brother the deacon Paul (afterwards Pope), and Ambrose, the primicerius of the notaries, to arrange for a peace. Soothed with gold, the Lombard agreed to a peace of forty years.[1] But in four months all thoughts of peace had left the breast of the ambitious Lombard. He made no secret of his intention of subjecting to his rule Rome and its dependencies; and, to bring matters to a head, calmly demanded an annual tribute of a golden solidus (12s. 6d.) from every inhabitant of Rome. Again Stephen made another effort to preserve the peace. And in the autumn the abbots of the two great monasteries of St. Vincent's, on the Vulturnus, and Monte Cassino were sent to the Lombard king. To their words Aistulf paid not the slightest heed but sent them off to their monasteries, forbidding them to return to the Pope.[2]

Whilst, on the news of this rebuff, the Pope, according to his wont, was engaged in recommending his cause "and that of the people committed to him" to God, there arrived in Rome from Constantinople, John, the Silentiary, with, not an army, but imperial rescripts for the Pope and

Muratori (*Antiq. Ital. Diss.*, lxvii.), was dated by Aistulf: "Ravennæ in Palatio, IV die mensis Julii, felicissimi regni nostri III per Indic. IV," *i.e.*, 751. (*Cf.* Murat., *Annal.*, ad an. 752, vol. vii. p. 18).

[1] "Tertio apostolatus ordinationis suæ mense disponens . . . . Paulum atque Ambrosium . . . . plurimis cum muneribus ad . . . . Aistulfum ad pacis ordinandum . . . . fœdera misit," etc. *L. P.*

[2] Almost verbatim from the *L. P.* *Cf. Chron. Vultur.*, iii., ap. *R. I. S.*, i. The abbey of St. Vincent, near the source of the river Vulturnus, is about twelve miles from Monte Cassino. *Cf.* Paul. Diac., vi. 40, and the notes thereto in Migne's ed.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Aistulf, demanding from the latter the restoration of the exarchate. Stephen at once despatched John, along with the deacon Paul, "to the said most wicked king"[1] at Ravenna. But John was sent off by the cunning Aistulf, with words and a companion, in the shape of an envoy from himself to the emperor. The Pope took good care to send ambassadors of his own also to Constantinople along with John; and through them he begged the emperor to send an army for the defence of Rome, and the liberation of the rest of Italy, from "the jaws of the son of iniquity," as he had "so often asked him to do in writing."[2]

In describing the sequel of events at this epoch, we cannot do better than continue to keep as close as possible to the very words of the *Book of the Popes*. Meanwhile Aistulf continued his preparations, and his threats. He would put every Roman to the sword if they did not submit to his rule. But Stephen called the people together, and exhorted them to implore God's pardon for their sins, assuring them that He would yet free them from the hands of their foes. Accordingly a great procession was formed to go to the Church of St. Mary Major. Litanies were chanted and images of Our Lady and Our Lord carried by the priests. The Pope himself, walking with bare feet, bore on his shoulders a famous picture of Our Lord,[3] thought to have been miraculously painted;

[1] Still *L. P.* The papal biographer never fails to prefix some strong epithet to the name of the Lombard king. And considering the aims of Aistulf, this need cause little surprise. Men are not wont to be tender when speaking of the would-be destroyers of their freedom.

[2] "Juxta quod ei sæpius scripserat." *L. P.* How clearly does this conduct of the Pope's show that it was not 'ambition' but 'the necessity of the case' that made temporal sovereigns of the popes of this period.

[3] Still preserved in the 'Sancta Sanctorum' oratory of the Lateran.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

while, fastened to the 'adorable cross,' was also borne along the 'treaty' which Aistulf had violated. With ashes on their heads, most fervently did the people beg help from God. The Pope improved the occasion by doing all he could to advance both clergy and people in virtue. The former he collected in his palace at the Lateran, and exhorted to devote themselves to the study of the Scriptures[1] and sacred learning with the greatest earnestness; and he was indefatigable in preaching to the people to keep from evil and lead holy lives. And for the safety of the country and of all Christians, he ordered the litany to be said every Saturday alternately at St. Mary Major's, St. Peter's and St. Paul's. Well may we ask with Mark Antony[2]: "Was this ambition?" . . . . "Ambition should be made of sterner stuff." But Stephen knew that if "we ought to pray as though our affairs were wholly God's, we ought to act as though they solely rested with ourselves." And so, realising that his efforts for peace, and his treasures, which he had freely scattered "for the flock divinely entrusted to his care and for all the province of Italy," were all thrown away, and "especially because he saw that there was no hope of help from the emperor, then, as his predecessors of blessed memory, the two Gregorys and Zachary, had done to Charles (Martel), he (Stephen) sent secretly, by a pilgrim, letters to Pippin, king of the Franks, unfolding to him the wretched state in which the Roman duchy was, owing to the hostile action of Aistulf, and imploring him to send ambassadors to Rome, who might ensure him (the Pope) safe conduct to their

[1] "Clerum . . . . admonebat divinam totis nisibus scrutari Scripturam." *L. P.* It is scarcely worth while to point out that this advice 'to search the Scriptures' was given by a Pope to his clergy some 800 years before the 'discovery' of the Bible by Martin Luther.

[2] *Julius Cæsar*, Act III. Sc. ii.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

master."[1] It is not often that any of the papal biographers in the *Liber Pontificalis* assign any motives for any action whatsoever which they relate. In this instance, however, it is most positively affirmed that the reasons why Stephen III. had recourse to Pippin were that diplomacy had failed to avert the invasion of the duchy, and that no help could be looked for from the East.[2] Historians, then, of to-day, who set forth other motives for Stephen's action than the two just given, may be set down as rather following conjecture, if not prejudice, than the records of history. And writers who blame the popes for appealing to the king of the Franks must be strangely forgetful that the yoke of foreigners is ever hateful; and foreigners to the Romans of the eighth century were certainly the Lombards, aliens to them in blood, language and customs. And surely they cannot call in question the right of one who is unjustly attacked in his goods, person, or liberty, to call anybody to his assistance.

In answer to Stephen's letter, there came first Abbot Droctegang (Spring 753), and then another messenger from Pippin, to assure the Pope that their master would do all that the Pope wished. By the hands of the abbot the Pope sent off two letters, one[3] of thanks to Pippin, telling him he had given Droctegang a verbal answer to his (Pippin's) communication, and begging him not to fail in the work he had begun. The other[4] was addressed

[1] "Dum ab eo (Aistulfo) nihil hac de re (sc. pace) obtineret, cernens præsertim et ab Imperiali potentia nullum esse subveniendi auxilium, tunc quemadmodum prædecessores ejus . . . . Carolo . . . . direxerunt, ... ipse . . . . clam per peregrinum suas litteras misit Pipino." *L. P.*

[2] Hence Gregorovius (*Rome*, ii. p. 275) asserts that Stephen 'was driven by necessity' to summon Pippin to his aid. On the very next page, cheerfully sacrificing consistency to an antithesis, he speaks of the Pope "as a rebel towards his lawful emperor!"

[3] *Cod. Carol.*, ep. 4. [4] *Ib.*, 5.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"to all our glorious sons and dukes of the Franks." There was the more reason for this that some of the Frankish leaders were opposed to war. Eginhard[1] assures us that Pippin was much hampered, "because some of the chief men of the Franks, his councillors, had been much opposed to his wishes, and had gone so far as to declare that they would desert the king and return home." "We have full confidence," writes the Pope to them, "that you fear God and love your protector Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles; and that for his interests you will, at our request, with all earnestness, come to our aid. And you may take it as certain that in return for your efforts in behalf of your spiritual mother, his holy Church, your sins will be forgiven you by the Prince of the Apostles, and that for your toil you will receive a hundredfold from God." In conclusion he begs them to support the petition he is addressing by Droctegang to their king.

Advance of the Lombards.

Meanwhile the Lombards were pushing on, and had just taken possession of a place[2] occupied by the serfs of the Church, when there returned from Constantinople the Silentiary John, and those who had gone with him from the Pope and Aistulf. John brought nothing but another rescript, bidding the Pope go in person to the Lombard king and try and win from him the restoration of the lost provinces. A safe conduct for the Pope and his suite was obtained from Aistulf; and Stephen was on the point of setting out for the North when some new ambassadors arrived in Rome from Pippin. These were Chrodegang,[3] Bishop of Metz, one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics

[1] *In vit. Carol.*, c. 4.

[2] Called 'Ciccanense Castellum' (Ceccano, a little south of Frosinone on the Via Latina). *L. P.*

[3] *Cf.* his life in Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, March 6. On the selection of Chrodegang for this work, see Paul the Deacon, *Gesta ep. Metens.*, Migne, t. 95, p. 709.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of this age, and Duke Autchar, who had come to escort the Pope into *France* (*i.e.*, Frank-land), in accordance with his wishes. With these various ambassadors, and a number of the Roman clergy, nobility, and military leaders, the Pope, though out of health, left Rome (October 14, 753), amidst the greatest signs of grief on the part of the people not only of Rome itself, but of the other cities of the duchy.[1] When Stephen drew near to Pavia, he was met by envoys from Aistulf, who bade the Pope on no account to dare to speak to their master in behalf of Ravenna, or of any other conquest made by him or any of his predecessors.[2] Sending word that no threats would make him keep silence on this matter, Stephen entered Pavia; and at once, after presenting the king with numerous presents, begged him to restore 'their own to each party.' But neither could the Pope nor the Imperial ambassador obtain anything from Aistulf. It required the strongest representations[3] on the part of Pippin's envoys before Aistulf would give the Pope permission to continue his journey towards France. He fretted and fumed, and used every means to prevent the Pope from fulfilling his intention of going to France. He evidently instinctively feared what would be the result to his ambitious schemes. His opposition was vain. As soon as his verbal consent was passed, Stephen, with his clergy, among whom are names that are not here mentioned for the first and last time (such as the priest Stephen, afterwards Stephen IV.;

[1] Direct from the *L. P.* Gregorovius, on no authority but his own (ii. 276–7), attributes a large share of these acts of the Pope to the previous agreement of the 'Roman people.'

[2] "Obtestans eum (Stephanum) nulla penitus ratione audere verbum illi dicere petendi Ravennatium civitatem, et Exarchatum ei pertinentem, vel de reliquis reipublicæ locis, quæ ipse vel ejus prædecessores Longobardorum reges invaserant." *L. P.*

[3] "Francorum missi imminebant *fortiter* apud Aistulfum." . . . "Unde, ut leo, dentibus fremebat." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the archdeacon Theophylact, a candidate for the papacy; the deacon Gemmulus, a correspondent of St. Boniface, etc.), set out (November 15, 753) with the greatest haste. But only did he feel at ease when they had reached those passes of the Alps that were in the hands of the Franks. Stephen made his first considerable halt at the monastery of St. Maurice at Agaune in Valais, on the Rhone, above Lake Geneva. Here, to escort Stephen to their king, came the Abbot Fulrad and Duke Rothard. And here the poor Pope had need of rest. In the weak state of his health, he tells us[1] himself how the long and arduous journey affected him. The distance, the snow and the cold, the heat, the floods and the rushing rivers, 'the atrocious mountains,' caused his weak frame absolutely to wear away —*pre phatigio validi iteneris caro nostra minuata est.*

Meeting of Pippin and the Pope at Ponthion, Jan. 6, 754

When Pippin heard of Stephen's approach, he sent forward his son Charles to meet the Pope; and himself, his wife, and a large number of his nobles advanced some three miles from the royal residence of Ponthion[2] to welcome the Pontiff. As soon as Pippin saw the Pope, he dismounted, prostrated himself to the ground, and for some distance walked by the Pope's side as his groom.[3] Arrived

[1] *Cod. C.*, 7 *G.* On St. Maurice, of which "little but the tower remains of the once ancient building," see *In the Valley of the Rhone*, by C. W. Wood (London, 1899).

[2] In Perthois, in the province of Lower Champagne.

[3] "Descendens de equo suo . . . . terræ prostratus. . . . Cui et vice stratoris usque in aliquantum locum juxta ejus sellarem properavit." *L. P. Cf. Contin. Fredegar.*, c. 118, who speaks of presents given by the Pope to the Franks and their king, and of the Pope imploring their aid against the Lombards. "Ut ab eorum oppressionibus . . . . liberaretur et tributa et munera quæ . . . . a Romanis requirebant facere, desisterent." *Cf. Chron. Moissiac.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 292–3, and the circumstantial account of the whole journey of the Pope at the close of the first part of the *Gesta Epp. Neap.*, c. 40. The first part was drawn up by an unknown writer about the beginning of the ninth century. (*Cf.* the ed. in the *M. G. SS. Langob.*)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

at the palace (January 6, 754), Stephen, with tears in his eyes, implored Pippin to take up the cause of "Blessed Peter and the republic of the Romans." Pippin at once engaged himself[1] on oath, after making a solemn treaty with him—*per pacis fœdera*—to fulfil the Pope's wishes with regard to the exarchate and the republic to the very best of his abilities.

Pippin anointed king. The Kiersey Compact, April 754.

After the interview at Ponthion, the Pope went to the famous monastery of St. Denis to pass the winter; and here he soon afterwards anointed Pippin and his two sons as kings of the Franks (754),[2] and declared them 'patricians of the Romans.' Furthermore, we have it on the authority of the author of the *Clausula*, already referred to, that he forbade, under pain of excommunication, any to presume for the future to elect as their king one who was not of the blood of Pippin! Thus did a Pope in person confirm what had been already done by the direction of his predecessor. A little later, according to the annals[3] in

[1] *L. P.* "Qui de præsenti jurejurando eundem bb. Papam satisfecit omnibus ejus mandatis et ammonitionibus sese totis nisibus obedire et ut illi placitum fuerit exarchatum Ravennæ et reipublicæ jura seu loca reddere modis omnibus."

[2] "Steph. P., postquam a Rege Pippino ecclesiæ Romanæ defensionis firmitatem accepit, ipsum sacra unctione ad regiæ dignitatis honorem consecravit," etc. Einhard, *Ann.*, ad an. 754. With his statement compare that of *Ann. Lauriss. M. G. SS.*, pp. 138–9; *Annal. Moissiac.*, *ib.*, 293, which add that Pippin and his two sons were anointed kings and patricians of the Romans; *L. P.*, n. 26; and particularly a note which a monk of St. Denis added to the end of a MS. of Gregory of Tours, in the year 767, as he tells us himself in the said note, and which has been published, among other places, in the *M. G. SS. Merov.*, i. In addition to corroborating the foregoing, the monk adds that the Pope forbade the Franks to elect a king outside the family of Pippin, who had been exalted by the providence of God, and who had been consecrated by the vicar of the apostles.

[3] The date is furnished by the *Annals of Metz* (ad an. 754, apparently citing a passage which has disappeared from the *Chron. Moissiac.*), and the continuator of Fredegard, c. 120. But these two authorities give a different place (Braisne) for the meeting of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

March, at the earnest prayer of the Pope, Pippin caused to be confirmed at a general assembly of the nobility at Kiersey (or Quiercy), on the Oise, what he had already undertaken to do for Blessed Peter and his successors.[1] We shall hear of the 'Kiersey treaty' again!

At present we refrain from any comment on these interesting and important transactions, that the simple narrative of the events themselves may make their due impression on the mind of the reader. It shall merely be added that subsequent testimony of various kinds, which will be noticed in the sequel, make it certain that a deed of gift (*donatio*) of the exarchate, etc., was at this great assembly presented to the Pope by Pippin.

Illness the Pope.

One or two events occurred just at this juncture, and prevented the immediate putting of this resolution into effect. In the first place the Pope fell ill, but at length suddenly recovered.[2] So rapid, however, was the recovery, that it was soon given out that it was not without the

nobles. The papal biographer, who is here an authority of the first order—as he was probably one of those who accompanied the Pope into France—gives (*cf. infra*, n. 1) Kiersey as the place of meeting. However, as the two places are not far distant one from the other, it may have been that some preliminary meeting was held at Braisne.

[1] Pippinus "congregans cunctos proceres . . . . statuit cum eis, quæ semel Christo favente, una cum . . . . bb. Papa decreverat, perficere." *L. P. Cf. ib., in vit. Had.*, i., where Hadrian asks Charlemagne to fulfil the undertaking given by Pippin and the French nobles at Kiersey to Stephen III. when he went to France: "Quando in Franciam perrexit, pro concedendis diversis civitatibus, ac territoriis istius Italiæ provinciæ, et contrahendis b. Petro, ejusque omnibus Vicariis in perpetuum possidendis." (*Cf. infra*, pp. 312, 410.)

[2] "Dum eum mane mortuum invenire sperabant, *subito* alio die sanus repertus est" (*L. P.*, n. 28). It was doubtless upon this statement that was founded the supposititious document known as *The Revelation made to Pope Stephen* (ap. Migne, t. 89). Belief in the Pope's miraculous recovery was already current in the time of Louis the Pious. (See a letter of his prefixed to the *Areopagitica* of the abbot Hilduin, who lived in the first half of the next century, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, v. 325.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

miraculous intervention of SS. Peter and Paul, and St. Dionysius (or Denis), as the Pope himself was made to proclaim in a document on the subject, which gratitude was said to have impelled him to put forth. It is interesting to note, in this curious forgery, that the title of 'most Christian,' which the *Book of the Popes* has now begun to prefix to the name of King Pippin, is here also assigned to the same sovereign.

Carlomann leaves his monastery and returns to France.

The next event was the arrival in France of the monk Carlomann. Aistulf, finding that Pippin was evidently determined to go to extremities with him, tried to put pressure on him to make him hang back, in a rather unexpected manner. The wily Lombard gave the abbot of Monte Cassino to understand that it would go hard with him and his monastery if Carlomann was not at once sent to his brother to induce him to stay in France. Thither, then, went the unwilling monk;[1] but he was doubtless not much distressed when he found that Pippin was not to be turned aside from his purpose. To avoid complications, the Pope and Pippin decided that Carlomann must retire to the monastery of Vienne. Thither the humble monk accordingly went, and there he died in peace in the following year (August 17, 755).

The Franks march against the Lombards, 754.

After no less than three embassies,[2] which the wish

[1] That he really went against his will is clear from the words of Eginhard (*Annal.*, ad an. 753): "Nec ille abbatis sui jussa contemnere, nec Abbas illius præceptis Regis Longobardorum, qui ei hoc imperavit, audebat resistere." *Cf. Annal. Lauris.* (ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 138). The words of these authors serve to modify the account in the *L. P.* According to the *Chron. S. Bened.* (*M. G. SS. Lang.*, 487), the Pope had a hand in the journey of Carlomann. "In Francia legatus pro rei publice a papa missus, ibi vitam finivit."

[2] In addition to the *L. P.*, see on these embassies *Contin. Fred.*, c. 119. Of the embassy by which Pippin offered money, the *Annals of Moissiac.* (*M. G. SS.*, i. 293) relate that when Aistulf asked what was required of him, the envoys answered: "Ut ei (S. Petro) reddas

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Pope for peace had caused Pippin to send to Aistulf, had failed, even with offers of money, to induce the Lombard king to surrender what he had seized, Pippin at length set his forces in motion. Even at this eleventh hour, nothing would content the peace-loving Pope but that Pippin should send yet another embassy to Aistulf; and Stephen himself wrote to him, begging him by the thought of the day of judgment to restore, without causing a loss of Christian life, their rights to the Church and the Republic of the Romans.[1] For sole answer came insolent threats. But Aistulf's arm was not so powerful as his tongue. The Frankish forces moved forward. Commending himself to his prayers, Pippin parted from the Pope at Maurienna, in sight of Italy's mountain rampart. The passes of the Alps were triumphantly forced by the Franks, and the month of September or October saw Aistulf besieged in his own capital of Pavia. A few days' fighting and Aistulf's resistance was at an end. Once again, at the suggestion of the Pope, terms of peace were proposed, and this time they were accepted by Aistulf. The Lombard gave hostages to Pippin, and swore 'to restore' Ravenna and the other cities that he had captured.[2]

The Lombards in arms again.

No sooner had Pippin returned to France, and the Pope to Rome, when the false Lombard was in arms again. To ensure victory he aroused the whole nation;[3] and, as appears from the Pope's letters, contrived mean-

Pentapolim, Narnias, et Cecanum, et omnia unde populus Romanus de tua iniquitate conqueritur; et hoc tibi mandat Pippinus, quod si justitiam S. Petro reddere vis, dabit tibi 12,000 solidorum."

[1] Direct from *L. P.*, n. 33.

[2] "Spopondit . . . . sub terribili sacramento . . . . se redditurum civitatem Ravennatium cum aliis diversis civitatibus." *L. P. Cf.* Eginhard *in vit. Carol.*, c. 4; *Fredegar. contin.*

[3] "Generalem faciens commotionem cum universo regni sui . . . . populo." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

while to throw dust into the eyes of Pippin. But Stephen was not slow to make known the situation to the Frankish king. Two letters[1] were despatched to him, one after the other (755?), pretty much to the same effect, but sent to let Pippin see that affairs were becoming daily more critical. They were both written at the close of the year 754 or the beginning of 755. Both were addressed to the Pope's "Most excellent sons, Pippin, Charles and Carlomann, kings and patricians of the Romans." The Frank is exhorted not to let his reverence and devotion to St. Peter remain inoperative, but to see that he withdraw not his hand from the plough now that he has begun to help the Church. "From the day on which we separated, Aistulf has endeavoured to afflict us, and to reduce the Church of God to such a depth of ignominy that the tongue of man cannot describe it.[2] . . . Not an inch of land has he returned to St. Peter, the church and the republic of the Romans. . . . Haste to restore to St. Peter what, under your hand and seal, you promised for the good of your soul. . . . To you have we committed the care of the cause of Holy Church, and you will have an account to render to God at the last day of how you have striven for that cause, of how you have laboured to bring about the restoration of his (St. Peter's) lands and cities. . . . For you know[3] that the Prince of the Apostles

[1] Ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 103 f., or *M. G. Epp.*, iii., epp. 6 and 7.

[2] The first of the two letters, viz., 6 of the *Cod. Carol.* "Nec unius enim palmi terræ spatium b. Petro sanctæque D. E., vel R. R R." . . . "Quod b. Petro polliciti estis, et per donationem vestram, manu firmatam, pro mercede animæ vestræ, b. Petro reddere et contradere festinate."

[3] The second of the two letters, viz., Ep. 7, *Cod. C.* "Sciatis enim quia sicut chirographum, vestram donationem princeps app. firmiter tenet." The whole of our people of the Roman Republic — cunctus *noster* populus rei puplice Romanorum—is as much distressed at the state of affairs as the Pope himself. *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

holds your deed of gift as it were handwriting against you." This deed of gift (*donatio*), so frequently mentioned in these two letters, refers, of course, to the gift by Pippin at Kiersey to 'Blessed Peter,' *i.e.*, of course to his vicar the Pope, of Ravenna and the Pentapolis. They were Pippin's to give by the right of conquest. Unable or unwilling to defend them, the Greeks had left them to fall into the hands of the Lombards. Taken from them by the Frankish king, they were of his free will[1] given to the Pope. These States are always said in the documents of the time to be 'restored,' because they were snatched from the hands of plunderers and were 'given back,' if not to the same men who ruled them before (viz., the Greek emperors), at least to the same people who lived in them before, and to a ruler of their own nationality, a ruler of their own religion, and a ruler of their own choice, whom they loved, and for whom they had taken up arms. The 'image-breaking' emperors of Constantinople were nothing to Pippin; but the popes were his benefactors, and to him, as successors of St. Peter, the earthly representatives of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Aistulf lays siege to Rome, 756.

At length, laying waste everything with fire and sword,[2] and carrying off "many of the bodies of the saints from the catacombs," Aistulf encamped before the walls of Rome in the beginning of January, and began the siege with considerable vigour. The attack was met with equal vigour by the besieged, who were

[1] "Propria vestra voluntate per donationis paginam b. Petro, sanctæque Dei ecclesiæ et reipublicæ civitates et loca restituenda confirmastis." Ep. 6.

[2] "Omnia quæ erant extra urbem, ferro et igne devastans, atque funditus demoliens." *L. P. Cf.* Hodgkin, *Italy*, vol. vii., bk. 8, c. 8. Unfortunately all this and the next vol. had been already written before vols. 7 and 8 of Dr. Hodgkin's work appeared in print.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

animated by the valour of the abbot Werner, one of Pippin's envoys who accompanied the Pope on his return to Rome, and by the Franks[1] who had formed his escort. News of all this was not long in reaching Pippin. But the siege pressed, and Pippin did not appear, so that, about the close of February, the Pope managed to get some letters sent off to Pippin by the abbot Werner and others, who went by sea.

First letter of the Pope to Pippin, 756, *c.* Feb. 24.

The first[2] of these letters was addressed to Pippin and all the clergy, nobles and army of the Franks, by the Pope, clergy, nobles, people and army of Rome, all in affliction. It opens by describing the arrival of the different divisions of the Lombard forces in the beginning of January, the different portions of the walls that they severally attacked, and Aistulf's demand on his first approach: "Give up to me your bishop, open the Salarian gate, and I will be merciful to you; otherwise I will overthrow your walls, and put you all to the edge of the sword, and I would like to know who will then snatch you out of my hands." Then follows a narration of their doings, which proves, up to the hilt, that the Lombards were but little less barbarous than they were when they first darkened the soil of Italy; that they were indeed the worst of the hordes that devastated that unhappy country on the break-up of the Roman empire in the West, and that those not subject to their sway might well resist them by every means in their power. And this, too, even if we allow that the picture drawn was as highly coloured as possible for the benefit of Pippin!

[1] The annals of Lorsch tell us of the "non minima Francorum manus" that marched with Pippin's envoys to Rome. *Cf. Annal. Fuld.*, etc., ap. *M. G. H.*, i.

[2] Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 111 f., or *M. G. Epp.*, 9.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Houses and churches they burnt to the ground, images of the saints they broke in pieces or cast into the flames, and the sacred gifts,[1] *i.e.*, the body of Our Lord Jesus Christ, they put into certain of their polluted vessels which they called 'folles'; and after they had sated themselves with other food, they eat these same sacred gifts; the sacred vestments they applied to their private uses; monks they put to the sword, and nuns they violated and then treated in the same way. 'All the '*domus cultæ*' of the Church they burnt, ... the vines and crops they rooted up. . . . . All the serfs of the Church and of all the Romans they killed or led captive. They inflicted greater evils on the Roman province than were ever done to it by pagan nations." Next is set forth the vigour of the attack, the various engines that day and night were directed against the walls, and the taunts flung at them by the Lombards, who cry out to them: "Let the Franks come now and pluck you from our grasp." The letter concludes with an earnest appeal for help, as the Franks hope for help from God.

Second letter of the Pope to Pippin.

Another letter,[2] conceived in similar terms, was addressed by the Pope in his own name to Pippin alone. In it Stephen asks for help because to the king of the Franks has he entrusted "God's holy Church and *our* people of the Roman republic to be protected." Still the troops of Pippin did not appear, and still the Lombard assaults continued, and so the Pope, to use the absurdly melodramatic language of certain authors,[3] "took the

[1] "Munera sacra, *i.e.*, corpus D. N. J. C., in suis contaminatis vasibus, quas folles vocant, miserunt, et cibo carnium copioso saturati, comedebant eadem munera." Ep. 9 *G.* One need hardly pause to call attention to the belief in the 'real presence' here expressed.

[2] Ep. ix., ap. Migne, p. 115; Ep. 8 *G.* "Sanctam Dei ecclesiam, et nostrum Rom. Reip. populum commisimus protegendum."

[3] Milman, *Hist. of. Lat. Christ.*, iii. p. 22 f. Gregorovius, *Rome*, etc.,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

impious step of writing a letter, as from St. Peter himself" —"ventured on the awful assumption of the person of the apostle!" etc., etc. That the Pope should write in the person of St. Peter is not in the least extraordinary, when it is considered, on the one hand, that Pippin had always before his mind that the Pope did occupy the place of St. Peter, for he ever spoke of helping 'St. Peter' and giving the exarchate to 'St. Peter'; and on the other, that the Pope himself believed, as *most* Christians have at all times believed, that he was the successor of St. Peter; was, as such, the Rock on which the Church of Christ was founded, and consequently had a supreme right to speak in St. Peter's name.[1] Nor is there, in the domain of *fact*, the least reason for believing that either Pippin or the Pope regarded this impersonation of St. Peter as anything more than a specially earnest and solemn mode of writing. To such as look at this letter with the eyes neither of Pippin nor the Pope, but with non-Catholic[2] and nineteenth century

ii. 291, has a few jocose remarks on this emergency provoking St. Peter to write, when even Arianism, etc., could not move him. Kellet (*St. Gregory*, etc.), p. 96, amuses himself by speaking of the letter as a 'papal forgery,' and Villemain, *Life of St. Gregory VII.*, i. 114, even assures his readers that this letter 'professed to be miraculous'! It is really wonderful how men can let their imaginations run on! As a corrective for this baseless rhetoric, take even Gibbon (*Decline*, etc., iii. p. 365, note): "The enemies of the popes have charged them with fraud and blasphemy; yet they surely meant to persuade rather than deceive. This introduction of the dead, or of immortals, was familiar to the ancient orators."

[1] To these reflections may be added this, that it was anciently the custom in charters, in which a 'church' was one of the co-interested parties, to replace the name of the said church with that of the name of the saint who was its patron or founder. (Poujoulat, ii. 211, quoting Ozanam, *Etudes germaniques*, œuvres comp., iv. p. 233).

[2] Non-Catholic writers are very fond of quoting a criticism of Fleury on this letter. We can only say that the injustice of the remarks in the passage in question is one of the too many proofs of the Gallican tendencies of its author.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ideas, not modified by a few grains of common sense, it may doubtless appear sufficiently awful.

Stephen writes to Pippin in the name of St. Peter, 755.

The superscription of the letter is as follows: "Peter, called to apostleship by Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God; . . . . and, through me, the whole Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church of God, ... and Stephen the head of that same Church . . . . to the most excellent men Pippin, Charles and Carlomann, and to all the clergy and people of the Franks."

After this the letter begins: "I, Peter the apostle, have been set by the power of Christ, the son of the living God, to be a light to the whole world. . . . To this apostolic Roman Church of God, entrusted to me, your hope of future reward is attached. And so I, who have adopted you as sons, call on you to defend this Roman state from the hands of its enemies. . . . Our Lady also in like manner and all the saints exhort you to have compassion on this city. . . . Give help to my people of Rome now, that I may be able to help you hereafter at the day of judgment. . . . Of all[1] peoples, your nation of the Franks has shown itself most well disposed towards me; and so, by the hands of my vicar, I have entrusted to you, to be delivered, from its enemies, the Church, which the Lord has given into my keeping. . . . If you come quickly to my aid, then, helped by my prayers, you will, after overcoming your enemies in this life, and being happy here, enjoy the gifts of eternal life; but if, as I trust you will not, you delay your assistance, know that you are cut off from eternal life."

The siege of Rome.

Whilst this letter is on its way to the Frankish monarch,

[1] Ep. 10 *G.*, ap. Migne, *l.c.*, p. 121. "Declaratum quippe est, quod super omnes gentes quæ sub cœlo sunt, vestra Francorum gens, prona mihi, ap. Dei Petro, exstitit; et ideo ecclesiam, quam mihi Dominus tradidit, vobis per manus vicarii mei commendavi ad liberandum de manibus inimicorum."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

for the sake of those who love to read of 'war and war's alarms,' we would be glad to give a description of this first-sustained siege of Rome that we have yet had to chronicle. But few details of it have come down to us. The Pope's letters to Pippin describe the approach of the Lombard forces in three great divisions. The army of Tuscany blockaded the entire west front of the city; that is to say, they were encamped along the length of the Tiber, which runs pretty well north and south through the city, from the gate of St. Peter and that of St. Pancratius (the old Aurelian gate) to that known as the Porta Portuensis. The royal standard was planted opposite the Salarian; and so the king's division would blockade the north and part of the east of the city; the rest of the east wall and the south of the city, to the gates of St. John and St. Paul, were watched by the army of Beneventum. The command of the waterway to the sea, however, seems to have remained with the besieged, as it was by sea that the Pope's envoys contrived to get to Pippin. It should be noted in passing that the fact that the Lombards never became a naval power in any sense of the term is one of the many proofs of the barbaric condition in which their nation ever remained. Nor had they even such knowledge of engineering as is necessary to subdue walled cities. So that, though the Pope speaks of the various engines[1] and contrivances with which they assaulted the city, it held out month after month. Distinguished in the defence of the city was the abbot Werner, whom the Pope describes as ever on the walls in his cuirass. We can well imagine this bold Teuton

[1] "Prælia . . . . cum diversis machinis et adinventionibus plurimis contra nos . . . . commiserunt." Ep. 9 *G.*; Migne, p. 112. Yet Mr. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 39, lib. ed., blandly assures his readers that "the safety of the city" . . . . was not "really endangered by these attacks"!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

warrior monk and his body of Franks doing yeoman service against the Lombards. It would be doubtless on account of his brave martial spirit that the Pope entrusted to him the conveyance of his first two letters to Pippin, after the siege had lasted some fifty-five days.

Pippin again on the march for Italy, 756.

The letters of the Pope must have had a prompt effect on Pippin. For as we are told by the *Liber Pontificalis* that the siege of Rome lasted three months, and that Aistulf broke it up to resist Pippin in the north, we may conclude that the Frankish monarch forced the passes of the Alps for a second time about the month of April 756. Whilst Pippin was thus engaged, there again arrived in Rome, with more words, the imperial envoy John, the Silentiary, accompanied by George, the Chief Secretary of State. Scarcely would they believe the Pope when he told them that Pippin was again on his way to free the Roman duchy from the Lombards.[1] They resolved to see for themselves. However, when, along with a papal envoy, they reached Marseilles, they had the mortification to find that what the Pope had told them was only too true. Their one object was then to get at Pippin by themselves, and before the envoy of the Pope could obtain access to him. Accordingly they used all the artifices in their power, and put as much pressure on him as they could, to keep the Pope's ambassador at Marseilles.[2] Finding that he was bent on going forward, George hurried into Italy by himself, and overtook Pippin as he was drawing near to Pavia. Offering him presents from the emperor, and promising him more, the imperial secretary implored Pippin to hand over the exarchate again into his master's hands. In

[1] "Dubium habuerunt credendi." *L. P.*

[2] *Ib.* "Nitebantur dolose missum Ap. Sedis detinere . . . . affligentes eum valide."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

vain. Pippin declared stoutly that he would not on any account alienate it from the power of Blessed Peter and the jurisdiction of the Roman Church and the Apostolic See. Then on his oath he added: "It is not to please man that I have so often engaged in battle. It is only for love of Blessed Peter, and to obtain pardon of my sins. No amount of treasure can move me to take back what I have once offered to Blessed Peter."[1]

Aistulf again makes peace, 756.

Pippin then pushed on to Pavia, and began the siege of it at once. In the autumn Aistulf was again at Pippin's feet. This time he did not escape so easily. He had to pay a war indemnity, become tributary to the Frankish king, acknowledging his dependence by an annual payment, and fulfil with regard to the Pope what he had promised in the former treaty; and, as a further punishment for his perfidy, he had to surrender to the Pope the city of Comiaclum (Comacchio) in addition.[2]

Aistulf's 'deed of surrender,' 756.

As what follows is of considerable importance in connection with the temporal power of the Holy See, we will give it almost 'verbatim' in the words of the *Book of the Popes*. "He (*i.e.*, Aistulf,[3] as is clear from

[1] *L. P.* "Asserens isdem . . . . rex, nulla penitus ratione easdem civitates a potestate B. Petri, et jure Ecclesiæ Romanæ, vel Pontificis Apostolicæ Sedis quoquo modo alienari; affirmans etiam sub juramento, quod per nullius hominis favorem sese certamini sæpius dedisset, nisi pro amore B. Petri et venia delictorum; asserens et hoc, quod nulla eum thesauri copia suadere valeret, ut quod semel B. Petro obtulit, auferret." As we learn from one of Hadrian's letters to Charlemagne (*Cod C.*, 56 *G.*, ap. Migne, 57), that prince made a similar declaration to the effect that he had undertaken his war against Desiderius "non aurum, neque gemmas vel litteras et homines conquirentes . . . . nisi pro justitiis b. Petri exigendis et exaltatione S. Dei Ecclesiæ perficienda," etc.

[2] *Cf. L. P.*, *Ann. Vet. Franc.*, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1416, and the various annals, ap. *M. G. H.*, i., etc. Comiaclum is to the south of the principal arm of the Po.

[3] As Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope*, i. p. 224 note, observes, most moderns (Gregorovius, etc.) confuse this 'donation' of Aistulf with the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the position in which the word—misit *or* emisit—occurs) drew up in writing a donation of all the cities (which he had to surrender) to be kept for ever by Blessed Peter, the Holy Roman Church and the Pontiffs of the Apostolic See, which deed[1] is still preserved in the archives of our Holy Church. To take possession of the said cities, the most Christian king of the Franks sent his counsellor, the venerable abbot and priest Fulrad, and himself returned to France. In company with envoys from Aistulf, Fulrad went through the Pentapolis and Æmilia, took formal possession of the various cities, and with the keys and hostages from each place, he reached Rome. There, on the confession of St. Peter, he deposited the keys of Ravenna and the other cities of the exarchate, along with Aistulf's donation. And to the same apostle[2] and his vicar, and all his successors to be *for ever possessed and ordered* by them, he handed over the following cities: —Ravenna, Ariminum (Rimini), Pisaurum (Pesaro), Conca (La Cattolica?, on the coast below Rimini), Fanum (Fano), Cesenæ (Cesena), Senogallia (Sinigaglia), Æsium (Jesi), Forum Pompilii (Forumpopuli), Forum Livii (Forli), with the castle of Sassubium (Castro Caro?), Monteferetri (Montefeltro), Acerragio[3] (not yet identified), Montem

one previously drawn up by Pippin at Ponthion and Quiercy, or Kiersey. *Cf. sup.*, p. 301, and the notes, where constant reference to this donation of Pippin is made by the Pope.

[1] "Quæ (donatio) usque hactenus in archivio S. nostræ Ecc. recondita tenetur." *L. P.*

[2] "Eidem apostolo, et ejus Vicario sanctissimo Papæ, atque omnibus ejus successoribus Pontificibus perenniter possidendas, atque disponendas tradidit, *i.e.*, Ravennam," etc. After the use of such explicit terms, it does not seem to require any elaborate discussion as to what kind of 'dominion' the Pope had over the exarchate. He was here clearly recognised 'absolute ruler' of it.

[3] Some would find Acerragio in Arcevia, and Serra in a locality called Serra dei Conti, both in the valley of Nevola, between Jesi and Fossombrone. There are two other Serras—one near San Marini

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lucati (Monte Luco), Serra (among the mountains that separate Umbria from the March of Ancona), the castle of San Marini (between Rimini and Pesaro), Bobium (not Bobbio in Liguria, but Sarsina, in the Pentapolis), Urbino, Callis (Cagli), Lucioli (Luceoli on the Flaminian Way; the modern Cantiano), Eugubio (Gubbio), Comiaclum (Comacchio), and Civitas Nariensis or Narni, which, though belonging to the duchy of Rome, had been for some years in the possession of the dukes of Spoleto." These cities, with the exception, of course, of Narni, meant practically the exarchate of Ravenna,[1] considered as including the two Pentapolises, *i.e.*, the territory bounded on the north by the Po, on the west by the Panaro and the Apennines, on the south by the Miseo (Musone), and on the east by the Adriatic.

The Pope was now undisputed sovereign not only of the 'duchy of Rome,' over which he had ruled with rapidly-increasing power from the Iconoclast disturbances in the times of Gregory II., but also of the 'exarchate.' The authority, which the voluntary action of its inhabitants,

(Serra del Sasso) and the other near Castel Bolognese. Castrum Sassubium is generally identified with Castro Caro. Montefeltro is the same as San Leno. For Conca, some point to a place which used to be inhabited, near the mouth of the Conca, a little to the north of La Cattolica, between Rimini and Pesaro. (*Cf.* Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 460.)

[1] Hence Eginhard (*Annal.*, ad an. 755–6). "Redditamque sibi (Pippino) Ravennam, et Pentapolim, et omnem Exarchatum ad Ravennam pertinentem, ad S. Petrum tradidit." In different MSS. of the *L. P.* there are one or two variations in the list of cities mentioned in this donation. The list given above is not far wrong, as all the places there mentioned occur in the confirmatory donations of Charlemagne, or Louis the Pious, if not in both. *Cf.* Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i. pp. 1, 2, 3. Certain it is that other cities of the exarchate were named in the donations, as we shall soon see the Pope asking Pippin to see that they are restored. Probably the above cities are here named because they were surrendered at once.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in the first days of the 'image-breaking' troubles, had given to the Pope in the exarchate, and which supplies us with the reason why all the deeds and histories of this period speak of the 'donations' of Pippin and Aistulf as 'restitutions,'[1] had now, by the valour and generosity of Pippin, and the 'indifference[2] of New Rome,' developed into full sovereignty. The subsequent course of this history will, it is hoped, afford further evidence of the truth of this proposition—anent the extent of the Pope's temporal power.

Stephen at once took possession of the exarchate. Sergius, the archbishop of Ravenna, was naturally named the Pope's representative in the exarchate, as the most important and powerful resident in that locality. But the inferior officers, or at least many of them, were sent out from Rome.[3] There cannot, therefore, be any doubt that henceforth the Pope is the real lord of the exarchate.

The dignity of 'patrician of the Romans.'

As, however, some authors have imagined that by bestowing the dignity of 'patrician of the Romans' on Pippin and his sons, Pope Stephen thereby limited his own power in the papal states, it will be to the point here to inquire into what was connoted by that title. According to Gibbon,[4] it was Constantine who "revived

[1] *Cf. sup.*, p. 305.

[2] Mr. Bury remarks (*History of Later Roman Empire*, ii. 502) that, among other causes that made the donation of Pippin bring into being an independent papal state, was the 'indifference of New Rome.'

[3] This is certain from a letter (*Cod. C.*, 49 *G.*, ap. Migne, 52) of Hadrian I. to Charlemagne. "Ipse noster prædecessor (Stephanus) cunctas actiones ejusdem exarchatus ad peragendum distribuebat, et omnes actores ab hac urbe Romana præcepta earundem actionum accipiebant. Nam et judices . . . . in eadem Ravennatium urbe residentes ab hac Romana urbe direxit." *Cf. Cod. C.*, ep. 54 *G.*, ap. Migne, 54.

[4] *Decline*, etc., i. 363. *Cf.* iii. c. 49, p. 367; Gosselin's *Power of the*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the title of *patricians*, but he revived it as a personal, not as an hereditary distinction (as it used to be in the palmy days of old Rome). They yielded only to the transient superiority of the annual consuls. But they enjoyed the pre-eminence over all the great officers of State, with the most familiar access to the person of the prince. This honourable rank was bestowed on them for life; and as they were usually favourites, and ministers who had grown old in the imperial court, the true etymology of the word was perverted by ignorance and flattery; and the patricians of Constantine were reverenced as the adopted *Fathers* of the emperor and the republic." They, *i.e.*, the patricians, were thus the highest class in the empire; from their ranks came the exarchs and the other higher officers of the State; and the name 'patrician' itself was often used to denote some high office for which there was another more distinctive or peculiar name. Thus we often read of the 'patricians of Italy, Africa,' etc., instead of 'exarchs' of Italy, etc. And so it came to be thought that the title of 'patrician' implied "the duty of protecting and defending those provinces." Hence Pippin spoke of himself[1] as 'defender' of the Holy

Pope, i. p. 219, note 3; and especially Jungmann, *Diss. H. E.*, xiv. § 51.

[1] In the *Annal. vet. Franc.*, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, 98, p. 1415, Pippin requests Aistulf not to afflict the Roman Church "cujus ille *defensor* per ordinationem divinam fuerat." Correspondingly in the various letters of the *Codex Carolinus*, Pippin is called 'Defender' of the Church by the Pope. The account of 'Patrician of the Romans,' given by Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. p. 281 f.) cannot be said to be quite accurate. He asserts that Pippin never makes use of this title. A plate of one of Pippin's coins, however, is given by Daniel (*Hist. de France*, i. p. 370), on which the letters R. P. are a further proof that Pippin did use the title. Gregorovius is nevertheless, we think, correct in concluding that 'with regard to Pippin's time,' *Patrician* is much the same as *Advocate* of the Church. And so Cantù, *Storia degli Italiani* (c. 68 v. 248): "Il titolo di patrizio, esprimeva il *patrono* della Chiesa,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Roman Church; and so was he spoken of by the Pope. Whatever, then, may have been the social position of a patrician, or whatever the power he possessed, it is certain that the emperor, in creating one, neither created a superior nor an independent ruler. Even if the patrician represented the sovereign, he still remained second and subject to the emperor. Any power he exercised in the provinces he administered in his master's name, and it was but delegated power. And when the popes named the Frankish kings 'patricians of the Romans,' they did not create officials who were to exercise power over the Romans independent of themselves. The patriciate, whatever else it implied, at least argued dependence. In appointing Pippin 'patrician of the Romans,' Stephen III. appointed him to be his defender and helper. It is true that history has often shown that there is danger in calling in 'defenders.' Powerful protectors often become the lords and masters of those whom they 'protect.' People with the best of intentions often find it hard to discriminate between the end of protection and the beginning of interference. We need not then be surprised if the Frankish rulers sometimes acted as if they were kings, and not simply patricians of the Romans.

Death of Aistulf, 756.

Towards the close of the year 756, the treacherous and cruel Aistulf, whilst meditating how he might most conveniently break his oaths to Pippin, lost his life while hunting. Desiderius, Duke of Istria,[1] forthwith proclaimed himself king, but, to his astonishment, met with a rival in

dei poveri e degli oppressi." Bury (*Later Roman Empire*, ii. 501) also speaks to the same effect.

[1] Not of 'Tuscany,' as he is often mistakenly called. (*Cf.* Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 756.) It is on the authority of the *Ann. Lauriss.* and those *of Einhard* (ad an. 756) that it is stated that Aistulf was engaged in preparing to violate his oaths. *Cf.* ep. Steph., ap. *Cod. C.*, 11 *G.*, "fidem suam temptans."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Ratchis. Whether it was that he had grown tired of the cloister, and once more sighed after the bustle of the world, or whether it was that he so far despised[1] Desiderius that he thought that such a man could never be allowed to succeed his brother, sure it is that Ratchis suddenly left his monastery and took up arms to oppose the pretensions of Desiderius. The latter turned to the Pope, and promised, on condition of obtaining his help, "to restore[2] the cities which still remained in the hands of the Lombards (*i.e.*, of course, certain cities in the exarchate), and, moreover, to present the Pope with a large sum of money." Acting on the advice of Fulrad, Stephen sent to Desiderius, his brother, the deacon Paul, one of his counsellors Christopher, and the abbot Fulrad himself. Desiderius renewed in writing the previous promises he had made by word of mouth. The Pope, accordingly, heartily embraced his cause, sending a certain 'venerable priest Stephen' to Ratchis, to point out to him his duty of returning to his monastery, and the abbot Fulrad with his Franks to the aid of Desiderius. The result of these measures was that the whole difficulty was settled without bloodshed. Ratchis again withdrew to his monastery, and Desiderius was recognised as king[3] about March 757. Before Stephen died, there had been surrendered to him the cities of Faventia (Faenza), along with the castle (castellum, a fortified place) of Tiberiacum (Bagnacavallo), Cavello, and the entire duchy of Ferrara.[4]

[1] "Cujus (Desiderii) personam despectui habens." (*L. P.*) "Gubernavit . . . . Ratchis . . . . a Decembrio usque Martium" — Catal. Reg. Langob. (ap. *M. G. SS. Lang.*, p. 503).

[2] "Insuper et reipublicæ se redditurum professus est civitates, quæ remanserant, immo et copiosa daturum munera." *L. P.*

[3] *Ib.*

[4] *Ib.* Desiderius kept Bologna and Imola, and probably Ancona, Osimo and Humana, till the fall of his kingdom.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Much of all this is confirmed by the last extant letter of the Pope to the king of the Franks. This letter was written in the beginning of the year 757.[1] After thanking Pippin very effusively, Stephen begs him to see that the rest of the cities, etc., of the exarchate be restored to the Church, because it stood to reason and was in accordance with the express declaration of the abbot Fulrad, 'who had inspected everything,' that the people in their neighbourhood could not live in security without the possession of those cities "which[2] had always been joined with them under one government."

Last letter of Stephen to Pippin, 757.

Then, in language stronger than, *as events go*, we should expect to hear in these days, but which the recollection of the treachery and fearful barbarity of Aistulf caused to flow spontaneously from the Pope's pen, Stephen went on: "That tyrant, follower of the devil, devourer of Christian blood, and destroyer of God's churches, Aistulf, has, by the judgment of God, been struck dead and buried in hell." By his own influence and that of the abbot Fulrad, the Pope continued, Desiderius, 'a most mild man,' had been declared king, and had undertaken, on oath, "in the presence of Fulrad, to restore to Blessed Peter the remaining cities (of the exarchate), viz., Faventia, Imola and Ferrara, with their territories, as well as Ausimus (Osimo), Ancona, Humanum; and

[1] And not at the close of 756, as it is dated in Jaffé. Ep. 11 *G.*, Migne, *ib.*, p. 126.

[2] "Quod nequaquam ipse populus vivere possit extra eorum fines et territoria atque possessiones, absque civitatibus illis, quæ semper cum eis sub unius dominii ditione erant connexæ," *ib.* Many authors who represent the popes of this period as ever grasping for more and more territory, do not take sufficient notice of such important passages as the above. If the popes had to rule the exarchate, it is very plain that as long as many important fortified places in it were in the hands of their enemies, the Lombards, the work of government would be impossible.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

afterwards through Duke Garinodus, and Grimoald, he promised that Bononia (Bologna), with its territories, should be restored to us; and he promised ever to remain at peace with that same Church of God and *our* people. He (Desiderius) likewise asked us to beg you to promise peace and concord with himself and the whole Lombard nation." Hence the Pope begs Pippin to grant his request in behalf of Desiderius, "if, as he (Desiderius) has promised, he render full justice to the Church, the republic of the Romans and Blessed Peter, and with his nation continue in peace with the Church and *our* people, as is set forth in the treaties which you (Pippin) have confirmed." Meanwhile Pippin is asked to apply quiet pressure, so that Desiderius will not fail to make the required restorations; and, in his negotiations with the Greeks, so to act "that the holy Catholic and Apostolic faith may through you remain inviolate for ever, and that the Holy Church of God may be rendered free and secure from their pestiferous malice, and may recover its property[1]; so that the 'service' of the lamps in the churches may not diminish, and that there may be food in abundance for the poor and the pilgrim."

As we have remarked, Stephen lived to see the 'restoration' of some of the cities mentioned in this letter, but not all. Desiderius was too much of a Lombard to be faithful to his word. Stephen's successor had to continue the struggle for the complete restitution of the exarchate.

The Pope and the Greeks.

Like his predecessors, Stephen did not fail, soon after his accession, to remind[2] Constantine that it was his

[1] Ep. 11. There is doubtless here reference to the patrimonies of Calabria and Sicily seized by Leo the Isaurian.

[2] *Cf.* Ep. Hadriani I., ap. Mansi, xii. 1061—the letter quoted at the beginning of the second session of the Seventh General Council.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

duty to restore the sacred images. His efforts were, however, no more successful than those which had been already made from Rome. Occupied for many years with the rebellion of Artavasdus, plagues, and wars with the Saracens, Constantine at length found time to make serious efforts to put down image worship. In the same year that he received the Pope's letter in behalf of the sacred images, Constantine caused a number of deliberative assemblies (*silentia*) to be held in the different cities, with the object of deluding[1] the people into embracing his views. And then, after the death of Anastasius, patriarch of Constantinople, the emperor summoned (754) a council to meet in the Hieria Palace near Chalcedon. Though none of the patriarchal Sees were represented in the council, no less than 338 bishops were ready at the bidding of an emperor to pass one decree after another against the worship of images, "sanctioning[2] their private opinions by their private authority." While denouncing 'the evil art of painting,' the council found it also necessary to denounce those who rob churches

The 'mock synod' at Constantinople, 754.

[1] Theoph. ad an. 744. "Populum ad suam sententiam amplexandam *dolose* pertraxit."

[2] The words of Theophanes, ad an. 745. All we know of the doings of this 'conciliabule' is what the Seventh Œcumenical Council has preserved for us in its Sixth Session. *Cf.* Héfélé, v. p. 307 (Eng. trans.). On this assembly the life of St. Stephen the Younger (written 808) may be also consulted. To the bishops who, maintaining that their gathering was an œcumenical council, tried to bring Stephen over to their side, the saint answered: "How can that be a general council to which the bishop of Rome has not given his sanction? For by the canons, ecclesiastical affairs cannot be settled without him." "Quanam ratione vestram Synodum Œcumenicam dicitis, quam neque approbavit Romanus pontifex (quamquam canone præscribitur res ecclesiasticas absque Papa Romæ constitui non debere) neque Alexandrinus," etc. (Vita S. Steph., ap. Montfaucon, *Analecta Græca*). Zonaras, a later Greek author, in his *Annals* (xv. c. 6): "Eum concursum profanorum hominum, Synodum Œcumenicam appellare non dubitavit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"under the pretence of destroying images," a method of proceeding by no means unknown to religious reformers who have appeared in England during the last three centuries! The immediate result of this base truckling of the Byzantine bishop to the emperor was a wholesale destruction of beautiful monuments and a general flight from the neighbourhood of Constantinople of the monks, who were staunch opponents of the despotic decrees of Constantine. Thus (interfering in the domain of conscience, and decreeing deposition to those of the secular clergy who would not conform to his will, and ordering that recalcitrant monks and laymen should be handed over to the arm of the State) was Constantine occupied when the whole undivided energies of himself and the empire should have been devoted to combating the Saracens and Bulgarians.

St. Boniface writes to the Pope, 755.

After following the history of St. Boniface through three successive pontificates, we have now only to speak of the closing year of his life (755). In the beginning of that year he wrote[1] to Pope Stephen to beg him to act towards him (Boniface) as his predecessors had done. For they had helped and encouraged him by the authority of their letters. Any good he may have done for the past thirty-six years (since 719[2]) for the Roman Church he desires to continue; and he promises[3] with all readi-

[1] Ep. 91, ed. *S.*; 108 *M. G. H.*

[2] See above, p. 156.

[3] "Si autem minus perite aut injuste a me factum aliquid reperitur, judicio Romanæ (ecclesiæ) prompta voluntate et humilitate emendare me velle spondeo" (Ep., *l.c.*). From this letter it is plain that Boniface had had no communication with Pope Stephen before this date. But Mr. Kellet, *Pope Gregory the Great*, p. 95, among his other numerous mistakes, writes as follows: "A dispute had meanwhile (during the Pope's visit to France) arisen between Boniface and the Pope. Stephen had infringed Boniface's metropolitan rights by ordaining a bishop of Metz!" etc. Had the Pope ordained anybody, anywhere, for

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ness and humility to amend anything that that Church may find wanting in his conduct. In conclusion he begs the Pope not to be annoyed that he has not written to him before, because he has had on his hands the restoration of no less than thirty churches, burnt in one of the inroads of the pagans (Saxons).

The jurisdiction of Utrecht, 755.

Soon after this first letter Boniface despatched another to the Pope. It appears that Hildebert, Bishop of Cologne, claimed jurisdiction over Utrecht (a place that the saint himself had formerly furnished with a bishop, in succession to St. Willibrord, or Clement, the apostle of the Frisians), and did not wish it to remain "an episcopal See[1] subject to the apostolic See, with a special mission for the conversion of the Frisians." But St. Boniface gave Hildebert to understand that the regulations of Pope Sergius in the matter must be adhered to, and wrote to Stephen to ask him to confirm his (Boniface's) decision if it seemed good to his Holiness. As Utrecht remained an episcopal See, the Pope must have confirmed the saint's action.

Death of St. Boniface, June 5, 755.

And now, feeling that his end must be drawing nigh—for had he not passed the allotted threescore years and ten?—Boniface, sighing for the martyr's crown, wished to end his missionary labours where he had begun them, viz.,

any See, Boniface at any rate, as even the letter cited above in the text proves, would never have objected. But Chrodegang had been bishop of Metz from 742! He died in 766. If Mr. Kellet has not made the assertion at second hand, he must have drawn on the *Passio S. Bonifatii*, a work written after the year 1011, and by one "who, at once credulous and destitute of any critical faculty, committed to writing whatever report had brought to his ears," says the learned Jew, P. Jaffé, in his introduction to the *Vitæ S. Bonif.* It is true that the Pope gave Chrodegang the 'pallium' for his exertions in his (the Pope's) behalf. *Cf. L. P.* in vit., and Paul the Deacon, *De Epp. Met.*, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 95, and the list of the bishops of Metz there given.

[1] From this second letter of St. Boniface to Pope Stephen (Ep. 97, ed. *S.*; 109 *M. G. H.*).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in Frisia. For in that country a considerable number of the people were still savage pagans. Accordingly, to provide for his flock, with the consent of Pippin and the clergy and nobility of his diocese, he consecrated his friend, countryman, and fellow-labourer, Lul, as his successor, in accordance with permission previously obtained from Rome, as Othlo[1] is careful to add. Then after commending those who had worked so well with him to the care of King Pippin, he took boat for Frisia, and, with a large number of devoted followers, received the crown of martyrdom (June 5, 755) on the plains of Dockum, near the stream of Bordue (Bordau). Thus, laying down his life for the truth he had so long preached, did Boniface gloriously terminate a useful and noble career, a career which elicits, indeed, the praise of God himself—"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace: of him that sheweth forth good, that preacheth salvation!' (Isa. lii. 7)—but a career which many men think of little account. "The good man dieth, and no one taketh any heed." But it is men such as Boniface that are the truly great. Many unreflectingly bestow the title of 'Great' upon those who have really been their scourges, who have deluged the world in blood, and have but degraded and brutalised our race. The reflecting will, however, see that it is those who have devoted their strength and energy to raising men from the level of the brute creation, and inspiring them with high and noble thoughts, who have the strongest claim on our gratitude, and whose memory we can never hold in honour enough!

Before, however, we take our final leave of Boniface

[1] *Cf.* Willibaldi *in vit. S. Bon.*, c. 8, and Othlo (ed. Jaffé, p. 83), "Nam ab apostolico præsule jam antea eundem pro se ordinandum impetravit." *Cf. sup.*, p. 236.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and his letters, which shed so much light on the history of his times, we may be permitted another word or two in connection with this great Englishman. With pardonable patriotism Bishop Healy endeavours to claim him as a countryman. "There is very good reason to believe," he says,[1] "that Boniface, though born in England, was himself of Irish origin." What that reason is we do not know; but there are two passages to be found among his letters which seem to show that he himself acknowledged that he was English not merely by birth but by descent. Asking the English to pray for the conversion of their continental brethren (the Saxons), he writes[2]: "Pity those who are wont to say, 'We are of the same flesh and blood.'" And, on the other hand, Torthelm, writing to him from England, says[3]: "Who would not exult and rejoice in your good works that *our race* (*gens nostra*) may believe in Christ, the Omnipotent God?" In the first case Winfrid undoubtedly seems to identify himself with the English to whom he is writing, and with the Saxons about whom he is speaking, and in the second case Torthelm would certainly seem to class Winfrid himself and the English as men of one race with the Saxons.

The other word we would say is this. Winfrid's letters are so full of grave matters in connection with Church or State, that it is exceptional to find in them remarks of a lighter kind. When, however, they are found, they must not be passed by unnoticed, as they are of the first importance in throwing light on his character, and do no little to increase the warmth of our feelings towards him. In writing[4] to Egbert of York, "In place of a kiss,"

[1] *Ireland's Schools*, p. 568, etc.

[2] Ep. 46 *D.* [3] 47 *D.*

[4] 91 *D.* "Vice osculi duas vini cupellas . . . . transmisimus."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he says, "I have sent you a little wine, and I beg you by the bond of love between us, spend in consequence a happy day with your brethren!"

Church restoration.

Stephen, too, did his share in the matter of the preservation of the ancient buildings of Rome. Among his other restorations[1] is mentioned that of the basilica of St. Lawrence, 'super S. Clementem,' in the third region. This we take to be the third ecclesiastical region, which is thought to have included the third (Isis and Serapis) and the fifth (Esquiline) civil regions; and hence it may be supposed that the particular basilica mentioned is St. Lawrence's[2] 'in Formoso,' or 'in Panisperna,' as it is variously called. This basilica was built on the highest point of the Viminal hill, and on the spot where the saint was martyred.

Rebellion of Sergius of Ravenna.

Before Stephen died he had to face trouble from within as well as from without in the matter of his sovereign rights in the exarchate. It would seem that he had named Sergius, the archbishop of Ravenna (*c.* 752–770), his deputy-governor over the exarchate. Sergius, however, had not long tasted power, ere he thought he would like it for himself. He, accordingly, began to rule the exarchate as though he were its independent ruler. Naturally displeased at this, Stephen had him promptly conveyed to Rome[3]—in what year cannot be

[1] *Cf.* Gregorovius, *Rome*, etc., ii. 314.

[2] There are altogether (inclusive of the one outside the walls) six churches in Rome dedicated to St. Lawrence. *Cf.* Gregor., *ib.*, i. 104; Miley, *Papal States*, i. 402. Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 457) identifies this church with a church of St. Lawrence *ad Taurellum*, spoken of in the life of Hadrian I. There was a region *De Tauro* above St. Clement's, between it and St. Peter's ad vincula.

[3] "Qui (Stephanus) archiepiscopum Sergium exinde abstulit, dum contra ejus voluntatem agere spiritu superbiæ nitebatur." Ep. Had. I., ad Carol. Reg. (*Cod. C.*, 49 *G.*, Migne, ep. 52). *Cf.* Agnellus (in vit. Serg., c. 4, ap. *R. I. S.*, ii. pt. i.), and Muratori, *Annal.*, ad ann. 757, 759,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ascertained—and there he had to remain during the rest of Stephen's life. On this and on other counts he was examined at Rome; and, from a letter[1] of Pope Paul I. to Pippin, it is clear that, though that Pope was pushing on Sergius' cause, he had not then (757) been restored to his See. By the year 761, however, Sergius was again in possession of his See, and acting as a true[2] and loyal subject of the Pope. Men easily find imitators of their evil deeds; the disloyalty of Sergius found an imitator in Archbishop Leo (770–777) in the time of Pope Hadrian.

Sergius of Ravenna, according to Agnellus.

In case the spiteful gossip, Agnellus of Ravenna, may have preserved for us any true details concerning Sergius amidst much that is certainly false, we will give the story of the archbishop of Ravenna as it appears in the pages of the silly abbot of St. Mary's and St. Bartholomew's. Considering that Archbishop Sergius only died some thirty-five years before the birth of Agnellus, it is clear that that worthy could not have taken the slightest pains to find out the truth of what he relates. For he confuses Stephen (II). III. with Zachary, and what was done by Stephen III. he assigns to Pope Paul, and *vice versa*. He plays equally fast and loose with the Lombard kings, and makes Aistulf change places with Liutprand, and in his three-page biography

770, etc. As Agnellus is not very trustworthy for events that occurred before his own time, and as he is hostile to the popes, as Muratori, and even Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. 333 n.), observe, no credence can be given to the details of this affair between Sergius and the Pope, as found in his mutilated history. Of the extent of the civil jurisdiction of Sergius, he is likely enough correct: "He judged (judicavit) from the confines of Persiceto (near Modena) all the Pentapolis as far as Tuscany, and *Mensam* Walani (ad Mensam Walani ?, ad amnem (?) Walani, the river Volano), like an exarch, and managed everything as the Romans now do."

[1] *Cod. C.*, 14 *G.*, ap. Migne, ep. 13, ad an. 758.

[2] *Cod. C.*, 31 *G.*; 26 ap. Migne.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

gives frequent occasion to his learned modern editor (Holder-Egger) to note "this is false," "this fabulous," and "this is very doubtful and fabulous."

A layman and married, Sergius, while still young, was elected to the See of Ravenna, probably by the influence of the Lombard king Aistulf. This, indeed, is not stated by Agnellus, but he tells us later that when Sergius came into collision with Rome, he was relying on the support of the Lombard king. His wife became a deaconess and retired to a convent. Succeeding in satisfying or hoodwinking the Pope in the matter of his election, he was consecrated at Rome. Supported by the papal authority (*apostolica auctoritate muniente*), and helped by his own bland words, he got the better of a schismatical opposition to him on the part of his clergy. According to Agnellus, Sergius lost favour at Rome because he did not go to meet the Pope (Stephen III.) on the occasion of his journey to *Francia*. The real cause was doubtless as stated above, and hence, no doubt, he was not brought to Rome till after the cession (756) of Ravenna to Pope Stephen. Hence there can be no difficulty in believing that he failed to obtain the support of Aistulf at such a juncture. And even according to Agnellus he was brought to Rome by his own citizens. The abbot continues: Arrived in Rome, he was brought before a synod to be deprived of his episcopal rank. And thus was he addressed by the Apostolicus (the Pope): "You are a neophyte; you did not belong to the (clerical) fold, nor had you served in the church of Ravenna, as the canons require. You took possession of the See like a robber, and, driving away those who were worthy of the Church's honours, you obtained possession of the See by secular favour and force." To this Sergius: "I obtained the See not by my ambition, but by the unanimous election of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

clergy and people. By the canonical questions you put to me yourself, you learnt all about me—that I had a wife, and had been elected while still a layman; and yet you said there was no impediment, and consecrated me yourself." It seems certain, however, that he was consecrated by Pope Zachary. On hearing this defence, opinions were divided, and at length the bishops declared they could not judge a superior. Thereupon the Pope angrily declared that on the following day he would himself tear the pallium from the neck of Sergius. But, says Agnellus, "by the judgment of God" he died during the night. At dawn Paul, the brother of the deceased pontiff, came to Sergius, who had passed the whole night in prayer, and asked the archbishop what he would give him if allowed to return home in peace and with increased honour. The captive at once promised Paul the treasures of the church of Ravenna. Whether this compact became known or not, Sergius, even according to Agnellus, got but a poor welcome on his return to Ravenna when released. Paul, however, was very nearly getting a much rougher one when he came to claim the treasures. Some of the clergy proposed to 'suffocate' the Pope, others to throw him down a cistern when he was looking for the treasures. Wiser counsels, however, prevailed; and in order, as one of them put it, that the Pope might depart with honour, their hands be kept unstained, the word of their pastor preserved, and yet their treasure for the most part maintained intact, it was resolved to hide as much of it as they could without the knowledge of the archbishop. Paul, however, arrived on the scene in time to get a considerable quantity of gold and precious vessels. Moreover, evidently becoming acquainted with the designs against his life, he managed to bring it about that the conspirators were sent to Rome, among them being the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

grandfather of Agnellus himself. They were there imprisoned for life. Though most of this narrative of Agnellus is unworthy of the slightest credence, there may lurk some grain of truth beneath it all. At any rate, it is not without its value as a specimen of the style of the worthy abbot of Ravenna, and as showing his weight as an historian. His imagination is quite suggestive of that of Matthew of Paris.

Death of Pope Stephen, 757.

In the midst of his struggles against enemies from within and without, Stephen fell ill. Tenderly was he nursed by his brother and successor Paul and by his friends. But to no purpose. Death found him out; and he was buried with great pomp in St. Peter's, April 26, 757. "His," writes[1] Dr. Hodgkin, "is certainly one of the great epoch-making names in the list of bishops of Rome. As Leo the First had turned aside the terrible Hun, and had triumphed over the Eastern theologians, as Gregory the Great had consolidated his spiritual dominion over Western Europe, and rescued for it a great province from heathendom, so Stephen II. won for himself and his successors the sovereignty over some of the fairest regions of Italy, gave a deadly blow to the hereditary Lombard enemy, and in fact, if not in name, began that long line of Pope-kings which ended in our own day in the person of the ninth Pius."

The one-line epitaph[2] of Peter Mallius,

Subjacet hic Stephanus Romanus Papa Secundus,

is thought to be only the first line of a fuller production.

[1] *Italy*, etc., vii. 243.

[2] *L. P.*, i. 462.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ST. PAUL I.

A.D. 757–767.

—◊—

Sources.—A short contemporary *Life* in the *Liber Pontificalis.* Thirty-one letters in the *Codex Carolinus*, all addressed to Pippin, except one or two to his sons Charles and Carlomann. With a few exceptions the order and dates assigned to the letters of Paul in the latest edition of the *Codex* (*M. G. Epp. III.*) are the same as those in the edition of Jaffé. The latest edition, that of Gundlach (*G.*), is the one cited below. The *Chronicles.*

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	King of the Franks.
Constantine (V.), Copronymus, 741–775.	Desiderius, 756–774.	Pippin the Short, 752–768.

Difficulty in writing the life of Paul.

To write the history of Paul I. is far from an easy task. The letters in the *Codex* are practically all undated. The answers to them are not forthcoming. And as it is from the Caroline Code that most of the details of the life of Paul have to be gathered, it will be readily understood that the view of the character of this Pope presented by an historian may largely depend on the chronological order in which he decides to arrange Paul's letters. And each succeeding editor of them has arranged them differently! The order adopted by Cenni, the most

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

widely known editor of the *Caroline Codex*,[1] is often considerably different from that given by Jaffé and Gundlach.

Another reason that makes the biography of Paul hard to deal with is that we have to treat rather of the fleeting shadows of great events than of actual transactions; the events of his life were, so to speak, more negative than positive. His reign was more distinguished by what might have happened than by what really did take place; *i.e.*, by unceasing diplomatic effort, Paul prevented the Lombards on the one hand, and the Greeks on the other, from effecting anything of any moment against the newly-acquired increased temporal power of the sovereign pontiff; he caused great events never to get beyond the eve of happening.

Charge against Paul.

The exertions of Paul in the matter of the states of the Church have furnished an occasion to certain historians to sneer at him, as though he had no thought nor time for anything else but to look after temporal affairs. No doubt, to the reader who judges of things as they look at first sight, these sneers may seem to be justified by what they may read in this very biography. But one must ever remember, in the words of the homely proverb, that "the coat must always be cut in accordance with the cloth." And in the life of Paul, the historian has nothing else to write about except his endeavours in behalf of the temporalities of his See, because chance has preserved the record of his doings in that direction, while the documents that would have enlightened us as to his other deeds have perished.

Besides, it is only natural to suppose that the establish-

[1] The most widely known because it was the edition reprinted by Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98. The later editions of Jaffé and Gundlach are superior ones.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ment in the exarchate of a new authority, such as the papal, would cause a great deal of trouble in any case, even if there was peace without. And, after all, thirty-one letters on one subject in the course of ten years is not much, even if they were wholly occupied with the one subject, which they are not.

Outline of the main events in Paul's reign.

It may be useful at the outset to give a short sketch of the principal occurrences of Paul's pontificate, which may serve as a guide through the details. The interests of Desiderius and Constantine V. would naturally lead them to work to increase their power in Italy. Accordingly, throughout the whole of his reign, Paul had to face attacks or threatened attacks on his temporal authority either from the Lombards, Greeks, or both. Paul's correspondence proves that to keep their independence for his people was just as much as he was able to effect. For, as may be well imagined, it took no little exhortation and asking to induce Pippin to take sufficient interest in the welfare of a distant people, when there were no immediate and tangible advantages to be gained for himself by his exertions. The more so that he had his own difficulties in Bavaria, and especially in Aquitaine. It was only the untiring watchfulness of Paul, and his ceaseless efforts in sustaining the goodwill of Pippin, that saved Rome from the truly 'unspeakable' misfortune of falling into the hands of the Greeks or Lombards. It was the latter of these two powers that gave the most trouble at the beginning[1] of Paul's reign. Then, from fear of Pippin, Desiderius toned down in his dreams of aggrandisement, and we shall find the Pope writing to Pippin to direct Desiderius to protect him (the Pope) against the Greeks. The trouble with Desiderius was not smoothed over before the difficulties with the

[1] *Cf.* Epp. 15, 16, 17, etc., edd. J. and G.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Greeks[1] began. In a word, the political situation in the time of Paul I. may be thus summarised. On the one hand, on the defensive, was the Pope relying on Pippin; and, on the other, on the offensive, were the Lombards and the Empire. Desiderius was striving for territory; Constantine for both territory and heresy (Iconoclasm). Whether from mutual jealousy or mistrust, or because the Bulgarians and Saracens gave the Greeks enough to fully occupy their thoughts, there was not any practical co-operation between the Lombards and the Greeks. But so irate were the latter against the Pope for his opposition to them, that they affected to consider him as a tool in the hands of the primicerius Christopher, whom we shall see playing a very important part, at least under Stephen IV.

Disputed election of Paul, April 757.

Stephen III. was still lying ill in the Lateran Palace, when certain eager partisans began to make preparations for the election of their own candidate. A number of them, to be ready, gathered together in the house of the archdeacon Theophylactus. But a still larger number both of the magistracy (*judices*) and the people made known their adhesion to Paul. However, as the papal biographer observes, Paul himself did not move in the matter, but continued his devoted attention to his dying brother. After the death of Stephen, the party in favour

[1] Certain authors (*e.g.*, Mr. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 40) suppose that at this time, and even much later, the popes admitted a "nominal supremacy of the Eastern Emperor," because they employed "the years of his reign to date documents." Apart from the fact that not a single letter of Paul in the *Codex Carolinus* is so dated, and from other considerations which the text will furnish to show that no manner of supremacy of the Greeks was henceforth acknowledged by the popes, it would be as reasonable to suppose that the Goths of Spain acknowledged that supremacy because their chronicles show that they dated events by the reigns of the Greek emperors! (*Cf. Chron. Albeldense*, etc., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129.) And the custom spoken of by Mr. Bryce seems to have ceased as early as 772. *Cf.* Hodgkin, *Italy*, vii. 253.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Paul, which was much the stronger, elected him as Pope (April 757), and the opposition broke up.[1]

On this election the reflections of Dr. Hodgkin may well be quoted. "We have already, in the case of Silverius, seen the son of a pope chosen for the papacy, though not in immediate succession to his father. Now brother follows close upon brother as wearer of the Roman mitre, almost the only instance of the kind that has occurred in the long annals of the papacy [Benedict VIII. and John XIX.—1012–1033—were brothers]. The choice in this instance seems to have been a good one, but it might have been a dangerous precedent. Considering the immense power which the popes have wielded, it must be considered on the whole an evidence of statesmanship and courage on the part of the electors that mere family claims have so seldom determined the succession to the papal throne."

Character.

To the candidate thus elected a most charming character is given by the contemporary author in the *Book of the Popes*. Paul is there described as a man of exceptional kindness and mercy. The testimony of 'many' is adduced to prove that during the night he was in the habit of going about among the abodes of the poor and the sick and administering to them every comfort both for soul and body Still under the cover of night, that his right hand might not know what his left was doing, he visited the various prisons, and oft set free those who were under sentence of death; and, by himself paying their debts, he redeemed the poor debtors 'from the yoke of slavery.' Widows, orphans, all who were in need of help, found in him a strong and willing support. He was careful to prevent, as far as he could, oppression on the part of his sub-

[1] *L. P.* Some authors, relying on their 'historic instinct,' suppose Theophylactus to have belonged to a Byzantine party, others to the Lombard!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ordinates; and never did he render evil for evil. There is, however, reason to believe that Paul was not always too firm in checking at once acts of oppression perpetrated by his subordinates. "If for a short time," writes his biographer, "any were oppressed (*quemquam tribulabat*) by his wicked satellites, it was not long before the Pope in his compassion administered the balm of comfort to the injured." It is easy to see that this weakness of the Pope must have earned him a certain amount of unpopularity. No doubt he would never hear of many who had been wronged, and many who have once been maltreated are not soothed by subsequent kindness.

John, the Neapolitan deacon (*Gest. Epp. Neap.*, c. 41), has preserved for us a pleasing little anecdote of Pope Paul, during the time when he was a deacon. A Neapolitan deacon, of the same name as the Pope, who was in the habit of often coming to Rome on public business, formed a close friendship with the Roman deacon. On one occasion when they were enjoying a chat, the Neapolitan said, "God grant I may live to see you Pope." "May I see you Bishop of Naples," was the prompt rejoinder. And so it fell out. But, adds John, owing "to the detestable image controversy which was at that time going on between the apostolic authority and the abominable madness of Constantine Caballinus, nine months passed, and still the Neapolitan Paul could not be consecrated. For the Neapolitan people favoured the power of the Greeks." Thereupon the bishop elect betook himself secretly to his friend, who was now Pope. He was at once consecrated by his old friend and sent back to Naples. "But, on account of the Greek connection, his fellow-citizens would not receive him," although they recognised him as their lawful bishop and allowed him to administer the revenue of his See. They relegated him to the Church

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of St. Januarius, which was not far from the city. This extraordinary state of things lasted nearly two years. At length, however, the chief men of the city (*primates*), perceiving that the people were yearning for their bishop, with one accord installed him in his episcopal palace within the city. He died 766 or 767.

Notifies his election to Pippin, 757.

Paul's first act, as "deacon and in the name of God elect of the holy Apostolic See," was to address a letter[1] to Pippin, "king of the Franks and patrician of the Romans," in which he informed that monarch of the death of his brother and his own election by "the whole body of the people." With "the approval of *our nobility*, we have decided to retain your envoy Immo, the letter went on, until after our consecration. Then, with our own messengers, he shall return to you . . . . our helper and defender. Meanwhile know that we are true to that fidelity, love and treaty which our brother offered to and made with you, and, with *our people*, we will ever remain in the same alliance."

Writes to Constantine in defence of the images; 757–767.

After his consecration, which took place on May 29, 757, inasmuch as he was "a stout defender of the orthodox faith," Paul commenced sending a series of envoys and letters to the emperor, exhorting him in strong terms to restore the sacred images.[2] But apparently

[1] "A cuncta populorum caterva mea infelicitas electa est. . . . Una cum *nostris optimatibus* . . . . perspeximus . . . . quoniam nos . . . . *auxiliator* et defensor rex, ... firmi et robusti in ea fide et dilectione . . . . atque pacis fœdere, quæ . . . . germanus meus . . . . pontifex, vobiscum confirmavit, permanentes, et cum *nostro populo* permanebimus usque ad finem." *Cod. Carol.*, ep. 12, ap. Migne and G. From the letters of Pope Paul it is abundantly manifest that the Pope considers Rome *his*;—its nobles and people were *his*. Pippin was but his helper and defender.

[2] *L. P. Cf.* Epp. 23 and 37 of Paul to Pippin in the *C. C.*, ap. Migne; J. and G., 28, 36. "Sed in hoc vehementer isdem imperator irascitur et occasionis versutiam adhibet, pro eo quod *nequaquam silesimus* ei prædicandum ob constitutionem sanctarum imaginum et fidei orthodoxe integritatem." Ep. 36 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

all without any other effect than to increase the bitterness of Constantine against the worshippers of images generally —the Pope included. With the exception of a list of his labours in the way of church restoration, this is practically the last fact of Paul's life that his biographer has recorded of him. We must therefore turn to other sources. Before entering on his relations with Pippin, as made known to us by the *Codex Carolinus*, a word or two on Paul's building operations may not be unacceptable.

Removes the bodies of the saints from the catacombs.

Finding that from age, and the vandalism of Goth and Lombard, the catacombs were, many of them, falling into decay, Paul with great ceremony conveyed thence to the city, from the more ruinous among them, the bodies of the saints, and placed them in the various churches. Among the other catacombs to which Paul turned his attention was the catacomb of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, or of Domitilla, as it was sometimes called, on the Via Ardeatina, about a mile from the Appian Gate (now Porta S. Sebastiano). From this catacomb, in accordance with the wishes of his deceased brother, and along with the clergy and people of Rome, he transported (probably October 8, 757), the body of St. Petronilla, believed to have been the daughter of St. Peter, to the mausoleum of Honorius on the Vatican hill, near St. Peter's. This circular structure had already been made into a chapel by Stephen III. in preparation for the reception of the saint's body. The honour of this foundation was assigned by the Pope to Pippin.[1] It came to be known as the 'chapel of the kings of France.'

In the fourteenth century there was still in existence

[1] *Cf.* the variant readings of the *Liber Pont.*, and *C. C.*, Ep. 13, ap. Migne, 14 J. and G. Sigebert of Gemblours (*Chron.*) refers this translation to the year 758. On the occasion of repairs made to the altar, the sarcophagus of St. Petronilla was discovered in 1474.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a church which Paul built or rebuilt (*fecit noviter*) in honour of the apostles SS. Peter and Paul (760), "by the Via Sacra, near the temple of Rome (or Romulus)." There were there seen, by the author[1] of Paul's life, the impressions said to have been made by St. Peter's knees on the stones where he knelt in prayer asking God to humble the diabolical efforts which Simon Magus was making to fly and thus to seduce the people. These identical stones are now preserved in the neighbouring Church of Sta. Francesca Romana (Sta. Maria Nuova).

As a last example of Paul's work in this direction, we will mention the fact that he built an oratory in St. Peter's in honour of Our Lady, and there placed a silver statue of the Blessed Virgin, and made himself a sepulchre. In imitation of St. Gregory I., and other popes, he turned his paternal mansion into a monastery in honour of popes Stephen I. (Martyr) and Silvester; and entirely rebuilt, decorated and endowed the old church that stood by it. This church, now known as 'San Silvestro in Capite,' is doubly interesting to us, as it was in it that St. Gregory I. preached many of his homilies, and as it was given by the present Pope (Leo XIII.) to the English Catholics. Into the renovated church the *Book of the Popes* tells us that Paul brought the remains of St. Silvester; and an inscription, still to be read at the end of the nave, near the Sanctuary, on the right hand side, after setting forth that fact, adds that Clement VIII. in his turn, some eight centuries later, renewed the church, and, finding the body of the saint under the high altar, there left it. In his new monastery Paul placed a number of Greek[2] monks, doubt-

[1] Variant readings. "In quo loco usque hactenus eorum genua pro testimonio . . . . in fortissimo silice esse noscuntur designata."

[2] *L. P. Cf.* the *genuine* bull of foundation, etc., ap. *Archivio della R. Società Rom.*, vol. xxii. (1899), p. 213 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

less some of those whom the violence of the Iconoclast Constantine had driven into exile.

Paul and Eadbert, King of Northumberland, 757.

In the first year of his reign,[1] Paul had occasion to write to Eadbert, King of Northumberland. Though the brother of Egbert, Archbishop of York, Eadbert did not hesitate to give an early example of a style of conduct that has found imitators in those who have since ruled in this country. He rewarded his courtiers with property that was not his to give—with monasteries. The result was that an abbot Forthred appealed to Rome with regard to three of such monasteries. Paul wrote[2] to the king, and exhorted him as an obedient son and out of love for St. Peter to restore the monasteries to their owner, the abbot Forthred. From the fact that Eadbert resigned his crown in this same year to end his days in the cloister, we may fairly conclude that the Pope's letter was successful in its object.

England and Rome in the eighth century.

Here it may be observed that it would be a great mistake to judge of a pope's relations with a country from such few facts with which the actual name of an individual pope is connected as have escaped the ravages of time. So with regard to our own country, though the loss of the papal registers has prevented us from getting to know much of the personal relations of the different popes of this century with England, we have records enough to

[1] The 'first year,' because the *Anglo-Saxon Chron.* (ad an. 757) gives 757 as the year in which Eadbert abdicated and retired into a monastery.

[2] The Pope says the monasteries were given to "cuidam Patricio, fratri ejus, 'Moll' nomine. . . . Quapropter hortamur solertiam vestram, et per ap. sedem admonemus, ut sibi vere obedientes, ob amorem protectoris vestri (S. Petri) prælato Forthredo abb., ipsa tria monasteria restituatis." In a note to this letter in the collection of Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 395, it is stated that the monasteries were probably those of Stonegrave and Coxwold in Yorkshire, and perhaps Jarrow in Durham. From this Pope, Jaenbert received the pallium as Archbishop of Canterbury. (*Cf.* Florence of Worcester, ad an. 764.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

let us see that they must have been very numerous. For in the eighth century there was a perfect *furore* in England for Rome and its bishops. Of this enthusiasm for Rome, St. Boniface was not, as some imagine, the cause; he was only an instance. The See of Rome was to our eighth century countrymen 'the glorious See.'[1] In Rome they established a special quarter, called after their own language the *Borgo* (burgh). There, they declared, they found 'the rest of life'[2] they had long sought. Thither they went for the forgiveness of their sins.[3] There our archbishops met the great churchmen of other lands and formed friendships with them.[4] Thither there journeyed on pilgrimage—kings and "noble and simple, men and women, soldiers and private persons, moved by the instinct of divine love."[5] Those who could not go yearned to go.[6] So many, indeed, went that, as might have been expected, not a few scandals arose in consequence. Many of those who in this century set out for Rome were women—those who had been consecrated to God (nuns) and those who had not. And, of course, many of them had not properly calculated the difficulties of the journey—its length, its dangers, and its expense. Beautiful, but in want of money and protection, many of them fell a prey to the

[1] The abbess Bugga: "Primum, pontificem gloriosæ sedis ad desiderium mentis blandiendum inclinavit (Deus)." *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 264.

[2] "Quod talem vitæ quietem invenisset juxta limina S. Petri, qualem longum tempus desiderando quæsivit." *Ib.*, 278.

[3] "Desiderium habuimus, sicut *plurimi* ex necessariis nostris et cognatis sive alienis, ... Romam peteremus et ibi peccatorum nostrorum veniam impetremus, sicut alii *multi* fecerunt et adhuc faciunt." *Ib.*, 263.

[4] Bregowin, Archbishop of Canterbury, 759–765, writes to Lullus, the successor of St. Boniface: "reminiscens, qualiter inter nos in civitate Romana de amicitiæ conventione conloquium habuimus." *Ib.*, 407.

[5] Bede, *De sex ætat.*, an. 720; *cf. H. E.*, v. 7.

[6] *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 263, 278, 406, where the abbot of Wearmouth speaks of my priest, "Romam videre desiderantem."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

passions of the foreigner. Hence St. Boniface, whilst begging the ecclesiastical authorities in England to discourage women from going on the Roman pilgrimage, declared that there was scarce a city in Lombardy, Frankland (Francia), or Gaul, where there were not Englishwomen leading a notoriously bad life.[1] But this ugly fact tells the story of the love of the English in the eighth century for Rome and the popes even more eloquently than the others which edify. So phenomenal was this devotion of our race to the Apostolic See, that in speaking of the English, a Frankish monk of this age could find no more suitable description of them than to call them the people "who were ever on the most friendly terms with the Apostolic See."[2] No wonder, then, that an archbishop of Canterbury declared that with those sacred doctrines with which the Roman and Apostolic See was in accord, all his countrymen were in full harmony.[3]

Paul becomes godfather to Pippin's daughter.

Turning our attention now to the *Caroline Codex*, we find that, in reply to the letter which the Pope sent him, Pippin returned (757) a kind letter, asking Paul to stand godfather to his daughter Gisela. The white garment (*sabanum*) in which the little princess was baptised was sent to the Pope. In acknowledging[4] (757 or 758) the

[1] *M. G.*, ep. 78 *D.*

[2] "De gente Anglorum, qui maxime familiares Apostolicæ Sedis semper existunt." *Gesta Abb. Fontanel.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii. 289.

[3] "Quicumque illius (Bonifatii) sacræ institutionis ac doctrinæ normulam rite consequuntur, pro certo se sciant et ipsius Romanæ atque apostolice ecclesiæ, a qua legatus eis directus est, ac deinde pariter omnium nostrum habere . . . . perpetuam communionem." Letter of Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 740–762, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 400. *Cf.* the teaching of St. Aldhelm, *sup.*, p. 85.

[4] *Cod. C.*, ep. 13, ap. Migne, 14 *G.* In this letter Pippin is spoken of as "Ecclesiæ tutor." "Direxit quippe nobis insignis bonitas vestra, per suos affatos, sibi innotescere adversantium causarum adventus." In the year 759, in the beginning of which Pippin had a son of the same name, we find (ep. 18 *G.*) Paul asking to be godfather to him as he had been to Gisela.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

...SITY ...A

receipt of this mark of Pippin's goodwill, Paul did not fail to point out that the Lombards had not manifested any intention of completing the restoration of territory which they had promised. For Pippin had requested the Pope to keep him informed as to the course of events. This letter Paul followed up (757 or 758) with another[1] to the whole nation of the Franks, in which he thanked them for what they had done for the Church, and hoped that in return God would render them victorious over all their enemies, to the great gain of the faith and the Church.

The Roman people undertake to be loyal to the Pope, 757.

Very likely at the same time when he acknowledged the receipt of Paul's letter, in which the Pope had notified his election to him, and at the same time asked him to be godfather to his little daughter (who was born in 757), Pippin, knowing their unsteadiness of character, addressed a letter to the Roman people, in which he exhorted them to be loyal to the Pope. To this the 'whole senate'—*i.e.*, the nobility—and people of Rome returned an answer.[2] After thanking God for giving them in the Frankish monarch such a 'defender of His holy Church'; and declaring that in accordance with Pippin's letters they will ever remain faithful to Blessed Peter, and to "our lord Paul, the chief bishop and universal Pope, because he is our father and good shepherd, and never ceases toiling for our welfare, like his brother, Stephen of blessed memory," they beg Pippin, 'their defender after God,' to continue to exert himself for the exaltation of the faith and their protection. And "by the living God, Who caused you, by the hands of

[1] Ep. 14, *Cod. C.*, 39 *G.*

[2] Ep. 15 *M.*; 13 *G.* "Nos quidem . . . . fideles servi S. D. Ecclesiæ . . . . et domni nostri Pauli summi pontificis et universalis papæ consistimus, quia ipse noster est Pater . . . . fovens nos et salubriter gubernans, etc. . . . Petentes et hoc coram Deo vivo, qui vos in regem per suum ap. b. Petrum ungi præcepit, ut dilatationem hujus provinciæ a vobis de manu gentium ereptæ perficere jubeatis."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

His blessed apostle Peter, to be anointed king, we entreat you to order the completion of the enlargement of this province." That is, they requested Pippin to see that the whole of the exarchate was surrendered by the Lombards. "The Romans[1] evidently recognised Paul as their ruler, and the king as his defender."

A last letter of this year (757)—if, indeed, it does not belong to a later date—of the Pope to the Frankish king, in reply to two received from him, is specially interesting, as it is generally credited with containing the notice of the first appointment, at the intercession of a prince, to what was afterwards known as a cardinalate, viz., to the possession of one of the titular churches of Rome. And so we find Paul[2] granting to the priest Marinus the title of St. Chrysogonus,[3] "with all the lands and property belonging to it, whether in town or country." Along with this letter, the Pope sent Pippin, in addition to a 'night-clock' and an antiphonary, the dialectics of Aristotle, the works of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, and various other works by different Greek authors.[4]

Desiderius takes the field (758) against the Duke of Spoleto, etc.

On the death of Aistulf, and during the disputed succession to the Lombard crown, the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum, who had been always striving for indepen-

[1] Gregorovius, *Rome*, ii. p. 308. Mr. Bryce (*Holy Roman Empire*, p. 64), however, asserts that Pippin had held the actual government of Rome as patrician. Mr. Bryce's great work would appear to be sometimes too much dominated by theory.

[2] Ep. 16 *M.*; 24 *G.*

[3] One of the churches on the other side of the Tiber (in Trastevere). It was afterwards the titular Church of our famous Cardinal Langton from 1200 to 1220. Like too many other cardinals, appointed at the prayer of those who have ruled in France, Marinus proved anything but a cardinal (cardo, a hinge) to the Roman Church. He sided with the Byzantines; and though Paul was finally reconciled with him, he at one time (Ep. 19 *M.*) had to request Pippin to have him consecrated bishop and sent away from the court. Ep. 25 *J.* and *G.*

[4] "Omnes Græco eloquio scriptores." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

dence, placed themselves under the suzerainty of Pippin. They were rightly convinced that the further away their overlord was, the greater would be their practical independence. Gregorovius, indeed, states that "Stephen had incited them to revolt against their lawful sovereign." But for this he adduces no proof. The letter[1] he cites in connection with his assertion affirms the fact that the dukes did place themselves 'under the power' of Pippin, but it is quite silent as to any share the Pope had in their act.

Taking advantage, probably, of Pippin being at war[2] with the Saxons, Desiderius resolved to bring back the dukes to his own obedience. On his way south he laid waste the Pentapolis, and was soon master of Spoleto and Beneventum.[3] Alboin of Spoleto and his chief nobles, "who had taken oaths of fidelity to St. Peter and to you—*qui in fide b. Petri et vestra sacramenta prebuerunt*," were taken prisoners. But Liutprand, the Duke of Beneventum, managed to escape to the ends of his kingdom, and established himself in Otranto on the Ionian Sea. Infuriated at the escape of Liutprand, Desiderius nominated a new duke of Beneventum (Arichis), and entered into communications with the Imperial envoy, George, who was then at Naples, and endeavoured to form a treaty with the emperor. He proposed that Ravenna should be attacked by the combined Greek and Lombard forces, and that, on its capture, the emperor was to be free to work his will in every particular.[4] With the aid of the emperor's Sicilian squadron, Otranto was

[1] Ep. 18 *M.*; 17 *G.* *Cf.* Steph. (II.) III., ep. 11.

[2] *Cf. Hist. de France* (Daniel, i. 377).

[3] Ep. 18; 17 *G.* *Cf.* Camillus Peregrinus, ap. *R. I. S.*, ii., pt. i.

[4] Ep. 18 *M.*; 17 *G.* from which all this is taken. "Suamque imperator . . . . adimplere valeat in quocumque voluerit voluntatem." *Cf.* ep. 15 *G.* Of this letter we have only a summary. It was already too damaged to enable a *verbatim* copy to be made for the Caroline Code.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

also to be besieged by the allied forces. Provided that Liutprand was given up to Desiderius, the emperor might have the city. When he had started this plan, the would-be wily Lombard king made a peaceful visit to the Pope to see if he could over-reach him. Before Desiderius could well openly break with Pippin, it was most desirable that he should get back the Lombard hostages still in the hands of the Frankish monarch. Accordingly he promised Paul that, if the hostages were sent back to him, he would restore Imola, the ancient Forum Cornelii, and the other places still in his hands. But the Pope was not to be deceived in that matter. However, to blind Desiderius, he despatched a letter[1] to Pippin (758), by Bishop George and the priest Stephen, afterwards Stephen (III.) IV., in which he asked him (Pippin) to restore the hostages and keep at peace with the Lombards. However, Paul furnished his envoys with another letter,[2] in which he unfolded to Pippin the ravages of Desiderius, as well as his perjury in not fulfilling his engagements. The Frank is warned not to attach any importance to the first letter, which was simply written that the Pope's messengers might have something to show that would save them from being detained by the Lombards.[3] In conclusion, Paul begs Pippin to see to it that Desiderius completes the promised restitution, and sends him, as a present, a jewelled sword, a ring and cloak, and rings for his sons Charles and Carlomann.

[1] Ep. 17 *M.*; 16 *G.*

[2] Ep. 18 *M.*; 17 *G.* This simple diplomatic ruse of two letters furnishes Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. 311) with an opportunity for taking a lofty stand. He thinks this action of the Pope would "perplex the judgment of austere Christians," etc., etc. With some writers the popes cannot do right. If they turn the other cheek to the man who strikes them on one, they are mean-spirited; if they exercise the natural right of self-defence, they are wanting in Christian charity.

[3] "Istas litteras tali modo exaravimus, ut ipsi nostri missi ad vos Franciam valerent transire." Ep. 18 *M.*; 17 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Desiderius 'restores' some of the territories still in his possession, 760.

The result of the Pope's appeal was an important embassy from Pippin to the Lombard king, consisting of Remedius (or Remigius), brother of Pippin and Archbishop of Rouen, and Duke Auchar. They met Desiderius in the month of March (760 or 759), and he promised, before the end of the following month, "to restore[1] to the Pope all the rightful claims (*justitiæ*) of Blessed Peter, to wit, all the patrimonies, rights (*jura*), localities, and territories of the different cities belonging to the republic of the Romans." This promise Desiderius kept in part. But giving up territory was to the Lombard like giving up his heart's blood, and his promise was not wholly fulfilled.[2] However, soon after this, more cordial relations began to spring up between Desiderius and the Pope. For, as we shall see presently, Paul had no difficulty in asking Pippin to request the Lombards to aid him against the Greeks. But that time had not yet come.

The Greeks begin to threaten the new power of the popes 761.

Pippin about this time became involved in a war with Duke Waifar, or Waiffer, of Aquitaine.[3] It may have been knowledge of that which emboldened Desiderius still to withhold the restitution he had so solemnly promised, and which induced the emperor to begin to turn his attention to the affairs of Italy. It would seem that he made no attempt to join in the alliance already proposed by the Lombard king to the imperial envoy at Naples. Why, we do not know. Perhaps on account of his difficulties with the Bulgarians. With them he was at war, generally successfully, from 753–775. Though he had sustained a

[1] Ep. 20 *M.*; 19 *G.* "Constitit ut . . . . omnes justitias b. Petri . . . . omnia videlicet patrimonia, jura etiam, et loca, atque fines et territoria diversarum civitatum nostrarum reipublicæ Romanorum nobis plenissime restituisset." [2] *Ib.*

[3] *Cf. Hist. de France*, Daniel, i. 379. *Cf. C. C.*, epp. 23, 24 *M.*; 27, 28 *G.* Pippin, indeed, was at war with Waifar, Duke of Aquitaine, from 760–768.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

severe defeat at their hands in the Balkans (759), he so far recovered from its effects that he became free (761) to turn his attention to the image question. He at once began a fierce persecution of the image worshippers; and, about the same time, commenced to interest himself in Western affairs. He intrigued in Rome, and gained over to his views, as we have seen, the priest Marinus. He made lavish promises to the Frank. He seems also to have intended to accompany his words with a display of force. At any rate, it appears to have been about this time that the Pope wrote[1] to Pippin to tell him that "most trustworthy subjects of your spiritual mother, our Holy Church, have sent us word that six patricians, with three hundred ships, and the Sicilian fleet have left Constantinople and are sailing for Rome. With what object this is being done, we know not. All we do know is that they are to call here first and then proceed to your excellency in Frank-land (Francia)." Paul had good reason to fear the diplomatic wiles of the Greeks. Just before his death, Stephen (II.) III. had had to warn Pippin against them. Constantine's envoy, the Silentiary John, was at the Frankish court, and Constantine's presents were interesting all the Franks.[2] The Silentiary John was succeeded by the imperial missus, George, whom we find[3] in Francia, in Naples, and in communication with Desiderius. Paul had to repeat (ep. 21) to Pippin the exhortation of Stephen against "the impious arguments and empty promises" of the "enemies of the orthodox faith."

The Lombards again.

If, however, at this time the Greeks came not, Desiderius did. Not only did he not keep his promises, made in

[1] Ep. 20 *G.*

[2] Many of the annals mention an organ sent by Constantine. "Venit organa in Franciam," ann. Nazar. (757), etc., ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.

[3] Epp. 15–17 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

presence of the envoys of the Pope and of Pippin, with regard to coming to terms on the basis of a mutual concession of claims, but he renewed his depredations in the papal territories and despatched threatening letters to Paul himself.[1] The ravages the Pope complained of were committed in the neighbourhood of 'our city of' Sinigaglia, and in the Campagna.[2] Paul accordingly begged Pippin for help, and asked him to send envoys both to Rome and Pavia (ep. 20). Desiderius also sent to Pippin and calmly denied having committed any acts of violence at all! The Frankish monarch accordingly confined himself to promising aid when it was required and to sending *missi* (ep. 21). These envoys soon found out the truth.[3]

Still help came not, only firm assurances from Pippin that he would stand by the promises he had made to Pope Stephen (II.) III. to do all he could "for the defence of the Holy Church of God, the Roman people, and the whole province" (ep. 22). Paul therefore reminded him that now was the day and now the hour when he should bring speedy help to the Church and 'this province by you set free.'[4] In his euphuistic style he wrote[5]: "Accordingly I beg and beseech you, my most excellent son and spiritual fellow-father, and, by Almighty God and the body of Blessed Peter, whose most faithful servant you are, I entreat you, nay, with the most earnest supplications implore you, to

Appeals for help, *c.* 762.

[1] Ep. 20 *G.* "Et plures deprædationes ex tunc atque multa et inaudita mala in nostris inmittit finibus. Unde ecce suas confestim direxit litteras, per quas . . . . comminationes nobis direxit." The letters the Pope sent to Pippin.

[2] "Hostiliter quippe in civitate nostra Synogaliense pergentes, ferroet igne, que extra eandem civitatem consistebant, devastaverunt. . . . Similiter et in partes Campaniæ . . . . talia sicut pagane gentes egerunt." Ep. 21 *G.*

[3] "Et satisfacti sunt vestri missi de tantis iniquitatibus et cognoverunt nostram veritatem et eorum mendacium." *Ib.* *Cf.* Ep. 22 *G.*

[4] *Ib.*

[5] Ep. 24 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

keep that carefully stored up in your holy, God-inspired and mellifluous heart, which the most blessed lord Pope Stephen, of holy memory, my brother, by divine inspiration, admonished and besought you to accomplish."

Pippin's difficulties, 763.

But at this juncture Pippin could only help the Pope by promises and by diplomacy. He was in the midst of his struggle with Waifar of Aquitaine, and his cause had been rendered wellnigh desperate by the sudden desertion (763) of the young Duke of Bavaria, Tassilo (III.) II. (748–788). In the light of subsequent events, viz., the duke's marriage soon after this date with Liutperga, the daughter of Desiderius, and his long alliance with his father-in-law against the Frankish monarchs, there is considerable likelihood in the supposition that this defection was brought about by the machinations of Desiderius himself. The consternation of the Pope can be easily imagined. It manifested itself in a letter which he wrote[1] to Pippin, begging him to let him know how the war was progressing, as a long time had elapsed since he had heard from him, and the enemies of both of them were spreading alarming rumours. The combinations of Desiderius, however, were destined not to succeed. The Greek emperor, either because he mistrusted him, or because, with the Bulgarian war and the persecution of the image-worshippers, he had more than enough on his hands, had up to this shown no disposition to co-operate with the grasping Lombard. And when, to the Pope's great joy,[2] Pippin extricated himself for the time from the Aquitaine campaign, Tassilo lost courage and repeatedly begged the Pope to intercede for him with his outraged sovereign.[3] To this request Paul acquiesced, and

[1] Ep. 27 *G.* [2] 28 *G.*

[3] Ep. 36 *G.* "Innotescimus christianitati vestræ, quod jam sepius nos petisse dinoscitur Tasilo Baiuariorum dux, ut nostros missos ad

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

despatched two envoys, the priest Philip and his chamberlain Ursus, to negotiate a reconciliation between Pippin and the Bavarian duke. That they should be reconciled, however, did not coincide with the schemes of Desiderius. He detained the Pope's envoys and would not allow them to proceed beyond Pavia. Of this high-handed conduct, Paul duly informed Pippin.[1] But with Waifar still unsubdued, the king of the Franks did not feel prepared just then to take warlike action against the Lombard. Although the day did come when the Franks exacted retribution from both Desiderius and Tassilo, Pippin confined himself for the present to diplomatic measures.

Greek alarms, 764 (?)

His envoys and those of the Pope were in communication not only with Desiderius but with Constantine. Paul informs Pippin that owing to the severity of the winter —numerous Frankish chroniclers[2] tell of the hard winter of 763-4—he has no word to give him in connection with their ambassadors at Constantinople.[3] These different embassies were not all undertaken to no purpose. Some kind of an understanding, more or less amicable, must have been arrived at about this time between Desiderius and the Pope. For when at Rome fear of Greek interference became acute, we shall see Paul begging Pippin to bid the Lombards help him if any attempt were made from Constantinople on Italy. And so when at last there arrived in Rome a messenger from some of the Pope's

vestram præclaram excellentiam dirigi annuissemus, ut ea inter vos provenirent, quæ pacis sunt."

[1] Ep. 36 *G.*

[2] 764. "Hiemps grandis et dura." *Annal. Alaman.*, etc. Numerous details of its effects in the East in Theophanes, *Chron.*, an. 755. It must be remembered that his 'years of Christ' are eight years short of the true date.

[3] Epp. 28 and 29 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

officials (*fideles*) in Ravenna, "who were wont to supply him with reliable intelligence,"[1] to report that "the most unspeakable Greeks, enemies of God's Holy Church and foes of the orthodox faith, were forming plans for a descent upon Rome and Ravenna," Paul in three letters[2] begged Pippin to induce the Lombards, their dukes as well as their king, to hold themselves in readiness to help him against any hostile movement of the Greeks, and to send him a *missus* who might take up his residence in Rome and so be ever ready to summon aid. "For as your excellency knows right well, it is for no other reason that we are annoyed by the Greeks than because we hold to the holy and orthodox faith and the tradition of the fathers, which they are eager to destroy."[3] On this occasion there seems to have been general alarm all along the coast of the Adriatic. The Venetians, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the maritime cities of the Pentapolis, all were in anxious expectation.[4]

Frankish envoys were accordingly despatched to Italy. As usual at this time, the embassy was composed of both clerics and laymen. It consisted of two abbots, Widmar of St. Riquier and Gerbert, and a *vir inlustris*, Hugbald. They had to assure the Pope that their master would exert himself for the exaltation of the Church and the orthodox faith, and would stand by the promises he had made to Pope Stephen.[5] They had also to try and adjust matters

[1] "Qui vera nobis semper adsolent indicare." Ep. 30 *G.*

[2] 30–32 *G.* "Petimus te .... ut .... confestim vestrum dignemini dirigere Desiderio missum, ut, si necessitas fuerit, significatum auxilium nobis pro incursione eorundem inimicorum impertire debeat, precipiens Beneventanis atque Spoletinis seu Tuscanis nobis e vicino consistentibus, ut ipsi nostro occurrant solatio," ep. 30 *G.*

[3] *Ib.*

[4] Ep. 31 *G.*

[5] 34 *G.* "Qui (the *missi*) apud Langobardorum regem inminerent regem pro diversis S. Dei Ecclesiæ causis ac justitiis et in nostro assisterent solacio." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

between the Lombards and the Pope, and to be a comfort to the Pope.

The missi had no difficulty in arranging the preliminaries of peace. In presence of the Pope they met the envoys of the Lombards, and from the Pentapolis and 'the rest of our cities,' and a mutual restoration of plunder was agreed upon. No territory was, however, restored by the Lombards; hence, in relating[1] these transactions to Pippin, Paul urged him to insist on the full restitution of both territories and patrimonies "in accordance with the terms of the treaty." For, as he very sensibly pointed out, if the Lombards were not made to give up everything to which they had no right, they would soon strive to recover what they had already (760) surrendered.[2]

Free to try and adjust the differences between the Pope and Desiderius were the Frankish envoys. They had not to trouble themselves about armaments from the East. Constantine had enough to do at home. A terrible storm in the Euxine wrecked the whole of a transport fleet destined for the Bulgarian war. The greater part of 3000 ships and their crews were lost (766). He had also to deal in the same year with a real or pretended conspiracy, one result of which was the cruel torture and execution of the patriarch of Constantinople (Constantine), whose Iconoclastic beliefs were thought by the emperor to be on the wane.[3] Copronymus had no other alternative but to fall

[1] Ep. 31 *G.*

[2] "Agnoscat christianitas vestra, quia, si nobis prælati civitatum nostrarum ab eisdem Langobardis invasi fines atque patrimonia reddita non fuerint, etiam ea, quæ primitus reddiderunt, invadere insidiabunt." *Ib.*

[3] Theoph., ad ann. 757 and 759. On this treatment of the patriarch, Hodgkin (*Italy*, vii. 252) remarks: "This depth of degradation, into which imperial tyranny had hurled the second patriarch of Christendom, is probably the best justification that can be offered for the Roman

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

back upon diplomacy. He accordingly sent envoys to Pippin, in the hope of winning him over to his Iconoclastic views. If he could make Pippin a heretic, the cause of the Pope was lost!

Greek envoys in Francia, 766 (?).

The imperial envoys, Authi, a *Spatharius*, or one of the emperor's personal bodyguard, and Sinesius, a eunuch, were bearers of both letters[1] and verbal instructions for Pippin. They were, if possible, to shake his orthodoxy, his devotion to the Holy See, or both. To gain time, or to conceal their master's real views, they were to pretend that the Western envoys, notably Christophorous, the papal primicerius and consiliarius, had not made their reports to the emperor in accordance with the instructions they had received.[2] But Pippin was not to be easily gained over to either the political or religious ideas of Constantine. He was convinced that it was politically advantageous for him to side with the Pope against the Greek and the Lombard, and he was steadfast in his adherence to the Catholic faith. For the Pope had taken care to keep him informed of the belief of the Catholic world on the 'image question.' About this time the patriarchs of Jerusalem (Theodore), Antioch (Theodore), and Alexandria (Cosmas) anathematised Cosmas, Bishop of Epiphania in Syria, because he had gone over to the emperor's heresy[3]; and "Theodore of Jerusalem, in a synodal letter to the patriarchs of

pontiff's eagerness to obtain the position of sovereignty, which, as he might think, could alone secure him from a similar downfall."

[1] "Simulationis ac inlusionis causa" (ep. 36 *G.*), Paul says they were written.

[2] "Adseruit (imperator) quod . . . . Christophorus . . . . sine nostra auctoritate . . . . suggestiones illas, quas sepius ei direximus, fecisset, et alias pro aliis ejus ac vestris missis relegisset." Baseless is the assertion, declares the Pope; and he easily scores a point against the Greeks, "in id quod nec suis nec vestris ac nostris credant missis." (*Ib.*)

[3] Theoph., *Chron.*, A.C. 755.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Antioch and Alexandria, undertook the defence of images; and they, after signing it, sent it to Rome (to Pope Paul) as their confession of faith in this matter."[1] A letter of this Cosmas of Alexandria to the Pope was by him duly forwarded to Pippin, "that you may learn what is addressed to us concerning the integrity of the faith by the Oriental prelates and the rest of the nations."[2] The synodal letter[3] just alluded to, which was also signed by 'very many Oriental metropolitans,' reached Rome after Paul's death, but was forwarded to Pippin by the antipope Constantine. Pippin, then, had no difficulty in knowing what was the faith of the Catholic world on the 'image question.' With regard to the political situation, he once again assured the Pope that no specious arguments or promises would ever induce him to be false to the engagements he had entered into with Pope Stephen.[4] He further informed the Pope that he had sent Authi, along with *missi* of his own, back to Constantinople, but was detaining Sinesius till an assembly of his bishops and nobles might be held, to discuss the religious questions raised.[5]

Synod of Gentilly, 767.

In the early part of the year 767 there was held at the royal villa of Gentilly, near Paris, where Pippin spent a great deal of his time, a synod of Frankish bishops. It is the general belief that this was the gathering which Pippin informed the Pope that he intended to bring together. All

[1] Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, ii. p. 128.

[2] Ep. 40 *G.*

[3] *Cf.* ep. 99, *Cod. C.*, ed. *G.*; 45 ed. *J.*

[4] "Per eadem vestra scripta significantes, quod nulla suasionum blandimenta vel promissionum copia vos possit avellere ab . . . . fidei promissione, quam b. Petro . . . . et ejus vicario . . . . Stephano, polliciti estis." Ep. 36 *G.* *Cf.* ep. 37.

[5] Epp. 36 and 37. "Significans (excellentiæ vestræ christianitas) . . . . eos (Græcos) aput vos esse detentos, interim quod, aggregatis vestris sacerdotibus atque obtimatibus, conicere . . . . valeatis, quid de his, quæ vobis directa sunt, respondendum sit." Ep. 37 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

we know of this diet is, that there were discussed at it the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and sacred images.[1] With regard to the former subject, there can be little doubt that it was 'the Procession of the Holy Ghost' which was discussed. It may be that the Greeks brought up this abstruse question to cover the little they had to say on such a clear point of Catholic doctrine as the image question.[2] Whether any good resulted from this 'great synod' is not known. Paul himself does not speak of it. He died (in June) not many months after it was held.

Final dealings with the Lombards.

As far as the chronological uncertainty attending the order of Paul's letter will enable us to speak, it seems that the tension between the Lombards and the Pope continued to decrease with his declining years. And so, in a letter which may belong to the close of the last complete year (766) of Paul's reign, and which has just been quoted (ep. 37 *G.*), we find Paul writing: "Your excellency made known to us that you had directed Desiderius to restore to us our runaway slave Saxulus. But your excellency should know, nay, we believe does know, that last autumn Desiderius himself came 'ad apostolorum limina' to pray, and brought the slave with him and handed him over to us. Moreover, after a discussion with him on the question of settlement of claims, it was agreed that missi of both of us should go through the different cities and there arrange all differences. By the mercy of God things have been settled in the Beneventum and the Tuscan territories. In the duchy of Spoleto some matters are settled, and every effort is being made to bring the rest to a conclusion. In

[1] "Habuit D. Pippinus . . . . synodum magnum inter Romanos et Græcos de S. Trinitate vel de SS. imaginibus." *Annal. Lauriss.*, ad an. 767.

[2] The faith of the Frankish bishops on the image question was manifested by them at the Lateran Council of 769. *Cf. infra*, p. 372.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a postscript your excellency informed us that you had instructed Desiderius to bring pressure upon the people of Naples and Gaeta to restore to your protector, Blessed Peter, the Neapolitan patrimonies, and to allow their bishops-elect to come to this apostolic See for consecration as usual. For this and all else we return your excellency most hearty thanks."

At all this Pippin manifested his pleasure, and expressed a hope that the Pope "would endeavour to remain at peace with the Lombard king." "If that *most excellent man*," replied the Pope, "will stand by the promises he has made to your excellency and to the Roman Church, we will remain in peace with him."[1] So friendly had the Pope and Desiderius become, that, in this same letter, Paul tells the Frankish monarch that he has agreed to go with the Lombard king to Ravenna, that together they may devise means of protection against the Greeks, who are daily threatening a descent on that city. It would appear that Paul died in the peace which his skilful diplomacy had brought about with that *most excellent man* Desiderius, king of the Lombards!

Various acts of friendship between the Pope and Pippin.

Though most of Paul's letters to the Franks and their rulers were taken up with the 'Lombards or the Greeks,' it must not be concluded that every part and all of them were so. In two[2] of them we see first the Pope giving the monastery of St. Silvester on Mount Soracte, where Carlomann had lived as a monk, to Pippin, and then Pippin giving it back to the Pope. Another[3] letter shows us the Frankish clergy eager to become perfect in the Roman chant; and the Pope entrusting a number of Frankish monks to the head of his school of cantors to be thoroughly trained in church music. It was still in Rome that the arts of civilisation were preserved! In

[1] Ep. 38 *G.* [2] Epp. 23, 42 *G.* [3] Ep. 41 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

return for the various presents which Paul made to Pippin, the latter sent the Pope an altar. This Paul had erected[1] in the 'confession' of St. Peter; and after he had consecrated it, he offered Mass on it for Pippin's spiritual and temporal welfare. Finally, another letter[2] gives us a glimpse of the work of the Pope for the interests of others besides his own, a branch of Paul's work which the poverty of historical material that has come down to us enables some historians to call in question. We refer to the letter (ep. 36) which treats of the efforts made by Paul to bring about a reconciliation between Pippin and Tassilo of Bavaria, about which we have already spoken.

The letters of Paul.

Here we must confess we are not sorry to leave the letters of Paul. Their monotony, with their opening of thanks to Pippin and their closing with prayers for his welfare, is anything but cheerful. It was doubtless as necessary for Paul to write them as it was for Ovid to write his 'letters from Pontus.' The effect on the reader is the same in both cases. Melancholy he can scarcely escape from. To their sameness, as one source of weariness in the student, must be added, as another such source, the uncertainty as to their year of issue. The student has only the grim satisfaction of feeling that his presentation of the events of Paul's reign may be all wrong![3]

[1] Ep. 21 *G.* "Quam (mensam) et chrismate unctionis santificantes, et sacram oblationem super eam imponentes, sacrificium laudis Deo omnipotenti, pro æterna animæ vestræ remuneratione et regni vestri stabilitate offeruimus."

[2] Ep. 36 *G.*

[3] Jaffé has assigned, in many instances, quite different dates to some of the letters to those given by Cenni. Not to mention those dates which differ only by a year, or those cases in which, for a definite year assigned to a letter by Cenni, Jaffé only indicates the period of years during which the letter was written, we find Jaffé relegating to 763 or 4 letters (epp. 23 and 24 of Cenni) which Cenni gives to 760; to 765 or 6,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Their lessons.

However, before taking our final leave of the letters of Paul I., it will be useful to listen to what they have to say in general as to the character of their writer and his relations to Pippin. They may indeed weary the reader from their verbosity and sameness, but they certainly impress him with the conviction that Paul's presentation of his case is the true one. They show him constantly[1] sending to Pippin the documents which he has received from Desiderius and others, constantly[2] asking him to send his missi to examine into matters in dispute on the spot, and constantly reminding him that his envoys have convinced themselves that the truth is with the Pope, the falsehood with the Lombard![3] They make it obvious that the Pope is the real ruler of the duchy of Rome, of Ravenna and of the Pentapolis. *His* are the cities.[4] *His* are the nobles and the people.[5] They, on the other hand, proclaim themselves his subjects (*servi*).[6] Pippin, on the contrary, in every variety of phrase, is spoken of as the Pope's helper, protector, and guardian.[7] He after God is Paul's 'security,' under his protection is the Pope's 'province,'[8] which must not be withdrawn 'from his (Paul's) power and jurisdiction.'[9] The letters of Paul exhibit him

ep. 28, assigned by Cenni to 761; to 767, Cenni's ep. 34 of 763; to 760, Cenni's ep. 38 of 764; to 761, Cenni's ep. 39 of 765; to 761–2, Cenni's ep. 42 of 767. In some cases Jaffé's date is certainly correct, as in the case of ep. 34. Gundlach's dates, again, differ from those of Jaffé.

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, epp. 20, 29, 31 *G.*

[2] Epp. 20, 36 *G.*

[3] Epp. 21, 22 *G.*

[4] Ep. 34 *G.*

[5] Epp. 12, 29 *G.*

[6] Ep. 13 *G.*

[7] Auxiliator, defensor, Epp. 12, 13; tutor, 14; liberator, 16; protector, 20; propugnator, 25 *G.*

[8] "Nostra est securitas," ep. 13 *G.* "Jubeat vestra excellentia ut . . . . hæc provintia . . . . redempta et a vobis b. Petro . . . . concessa ab emulorum insidiis vestra consueta permaneat protectione," ep. 30 *G.*

[9] Ep. 37 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not only as pursuing a straightforward policy in a truthful way, but as possessed of a forgiving character. He pleads for Tassilo, who, as the foe of Pippin, was his enemy also; and, at the prayers of a blind mother, he *punishes* the traitor Marinus by getting him made a bishop![1] Finally, they prove that the 'Kiersey treaty,' by which both the Pope and Pippin[2] expressed their determination to stand, was to be set for the ruin and the resurrection of many!

Death of Pope Paul, June 28, 767.

To avoid the great heat of the summer in Rome, Paul had retired to St. Paul's outside the walls. He was, however, stricken down there with a mortal sickness; and though, when others abandoned him, probably in fear on account of the stormy events to be related in the life of Stephen (III.) IV., he was as carefully nursed by his successor Stephen as he himself (Paul) had attended his brother,[3] he died June 28, 767.

Here for three months was left the body of Paul. At the end of that period, however, "all the Roman citizens and the other nations," who lived in special quarters in Rome, and were spoken of as 'scholæ,' transported the said body by water to St. Peter's, whilst singing the Psalms for the dead. The body was then placed in the oratory, in which Paul had himself prepared his tomb.[4] Over his sepulchre were written the simple words: "Hic requiescit Paulus Papa." In the Roman martyrology he is honoured as a saint on June 28.

[1] Epp. 25, 29 *G.* [2] Epp. 12, 36 *G.*

[3] *Cf. L. P.* in vit., and also in vit. Steph. IV. *Cf.* also a fragment of the Acts of the Lateran Council of 769, ap. Cenni, *Conc. Lat.*, and *L. P.*, i. 480.

[4] *L. P.* Gregorovius (*Rome*, ii. p. 320) concludes from "the tumultuous scenes amid which his latest hours were spent"—(but which were not caused by the *Romans*, but were introduced from *without*)—that Paul, "as temporal ruler of the city," "was by no means popular." The respect paid to his body is enough to prove the opposite. The delay in the paying of it was caused by the troubles that ensued on his death.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

STEPHEN (III.) IV.

A.D. 768–772.

Sources.—A comparatively full, detailed and contemporary life in the *L. P.* Two letters of the antipope Constantine and five of Stephen in the *Caroline Codex*. A few other letters of the Pope on the affairs of Italy, etc., in different authors. The acts of the Lateran Council (769), fragments of which have been published by Cenni (*Conc. Lat.*, ann. 769, Rome, 1735—a very rare work), and then by Mansi, *Conc.*, xii. Other fragments have been since discovered by Wasserschleben. The most important portion of Cenni's fragment has been printed by Duchesne (*L. P.*, i. 480–1), who has also published what has been preserved to us of the report of the ambassador (Creontius) of Tassilo of Bavaria on the fall of Christopher and Sergius. Like Stephen's biographer, the ambassador shows himself favourably disposed to Christopher. The actual words of the so-called Creontius, the Secretary of Tassilo III. (748–788), are no longer in existence. But the substance of his narrative was incorporated into his *Annales Boiorum* by Adventinus, *i.e.*, John Turmair, a writer of the sixteenth century. The *Chronicles*.

Modern Works.—On the careers of Christopher and Sergius, read *Mem. ed. Apologie intorno ai Som. Pont.*, by L. Tripepi, p. 321 *seq.*

Emperor of the East.	King of the Lombards.	Kings of the Franks.
Constantine V., Copronymus, 741–775.	Desiderius, 756–774.	Pippin, the Short, 752–768.
		Charlemagne and Carlomann, 768–771.
		Charlemagne, 771–800.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Election of an antipope, June 28, 767.

THE election of Pope Stephen IV. was unfortunately preceded by a series of disorders that had a very tragic termination. These disturbances were brought about by the ambition of a man, who was, as it seems, one of the papal governors. Very desirous that the great spiritual and now considerable temporal power also of the papacy should be wielded by one of his own family, he would not even wait for the death of Paul to begin his nefarious designs. Accordingly this aspiring noble, Toto, duke or governor of Nepi, began to plot against the life of Paul. His schemes were for a time frustrated by the watchfulness of Christopher, the primicerius of the notaries, who brought together into his house Toto and other notables, and made them swear[1] that the new Pope should only be chosen by common consent and from the Roman clergy, and that none of the country-people should be introduced into the city. Toto, however, had no intention of allowing himself to be fettered by an oath. He retired to Nepi, and, with the aid of his brothers, Constantine, Passivus, and Paschal, collected troops from Nepi and other parts of Tuscany, as well as a crowd of armed peasants. Before Paul had breathed his last, this armed band broke into the city by the gate of St. Pancratius. On the death of Paul, Christopher, in his deposition before the Lateran Council, said that all at once assembled in the "Basilica of the Apostles," and that before they parted he had made all swear that they would respect one another's rights. No sooner, however, had the meeting broken up than Toto's adherents assembled at his town residence and elected Constantine,

[1] "Sacramentum mutuo præbuimus quod nullus, extra alium, electionem egisset, sed eum quem ex suo consilio divina providentia tribuisset, ex corpore S. nostræ ecclesiæ, videlicet de sacerdotibus vel diaconibus . . . . nobis eligeremus antistitem." (From the declaration of Christopher before the Council of 769.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

though yet a layman, Pope. At the point of the sword, the antipope was introduced into the Lateran Palace.[1]

Rapid ordination of the antipope.

Next an attempt was made to force George, Bishop of Præneste, to give the tonsure to Constantine. This at first George refused to do, but threw himself at the feet of the usurper and adjured him by all that was sacred to give up his impious attempt and not be the cause of such a wicked novelty being introduced into the Church.[2] But the conspirators very soon gave the poor bishop to understand that he must do their behests or take the consequences. In fear, therefore, George performed the ceremony of giving the tonsure, and Constantine was a cleric. The next day, Monday, the same bishop had to make the antipope a subdeacon and a deacon, quite, of course, against[3] the canons, which require an interval between the giving of the major orders of at least a day. The people were then forced to take an oath of fidelity to Constantine, who, again by the persuasive action of the sword, was consecrated bishop (July 5, 767) by George, Eustratius of Albano and Citonatus of Porto, and contrived to hold the See for over a year.

Writes to Pippin, 767.

One of the antipope's first acts was to write to Pippin, with a view of securing that prince's adhesion to his election. He boldly declared[4] to the Frankish king that,

[1] With the *L. P.* compare the fuller account in the Acts of the Lateran Synod in Duchesne.

[2] *L. P.* "Corruensque in terram prostravit se pedibus ipsius Constantini," etc.

[3] *Ib.* "Contra sanctorum canonum instituta." The *L. P.*, in vit. Steph. IV., relates that a few days after Constantine's consecration, George was struck with paralysis, and, unable to raise his hand to his mouth, soon died.

[4] *Cod. Carol.*, ep. 98 *G.* "Urbis vel subjacentium ei civitatum populus meam infelicitatem sibimet præesse pastorem elegerunt." As Duchesne takes note, Constantine does not seem to have been aware that the fact of the people of the neighbouring cities having taken part in his election constituted a serious *irregularity*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

contrary to his wishes and merits, the people of "Rome, and of the cities adjoining it," had raised him to the high dignity of successor of the apostles, and begs for a continuation of the friendship which Pippin had shown to Stephen III. and to Paul. In answer to his request, he sends Pippin such of the *Lives of the Saints* as he could find. The request had, of course, been made during the lifetime of Paul.

Of this letter Pippin, who had doubtless been more or less correctly apprised of the true state of affairs from other sources, took not the slightest notice. Accordingly Constantine sent him another letter,[1] in which he again affirmed that the united action of the multitude had forced him to accept the heavy burden of taking charge of the Lord's 'rational sheep.' Then, after hypocritically introducing a considerable number of Scripture texts, he earnestly begs Pippin for his friendship, promises that 'he and his people' will cherish the Franks and their king even more than his predecessors have done, and so begs Pippin not to put any faith in what may be said against him.

Faith of the Oriental patriarchs on the subject of the holy images.

Of special interest in this artful document is the paragraph in which the antipope tells Pippin that he is sending him a copy in Greek and in Latin of a letter, which, on the 12th of August, he had received from the East. This letter, addressed to Pope Paul, Constantine describes as a 'synodical letter of faith' (*synodica fidei*) sent by Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, and endorsed by the patriarchs of Antioch (Theodore) and Alexandria (Cosmas), and a considerable number of Oriental metropolitans. Constantine, after reading it publicly to the people, sent a copy of it to

[1] This second letter was despatched after August 767. "Testis nobis Deus . . . . ut plus etiam quam . . . . prædecessores pontifices in vestra . . . . regni Francorum charitate . . . . cum omni *nostro* populo firma constantia erimus permansuri." *Ib.*, ep. 45 *J.*; 99 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Pippin, "that he might see," he said, "what zeal there was in the cause of the holy images[1] throughout the whole Christian East."

There was at this time, and there had been for some time previously, considerable activity in that part of the East not under the sway of Constantine V., in behalf of the holy images. Pope Paul had received a profession of faith on that subject from Cosmas,[2] patriarch of Alexandria, who there restored the Catholic succession. This profession Paul had sent[3] to Pippin, "that he might know the letters which the Pope received in connection with what was being done for the integrity of the faith by the Oriental bishops and by the other nations." Unfortunately Charlemagne, when he caused the collection of papal letters, which bears his name, to be drawn up, did not order the letters which accompanied them to be included in the collection. Hence these letters, of such importance for showing the true faith of the Eastern Church on the image question at this time, have perished. The bishops under Moslem rule were free from the tyranny of the Byzantine emperor. Hence their letters and synods[4] show that their faith on the subject of 'images' was as that of the Pope and the West. Owing, however, to the obscurity which envelops the history of the Oriental patriarch at this period, it is quite impossible to state with any certainty the occasion of the drawing up of the letters

[1] "Ut agnoscatis qualis fervor sanctarum imaginum orientalibus in partibus cunctis Christianis inminet.' *Ib.*

[2] *Cf.* Neale's *Patr. of Alex.*, ii. pp. 108, 128, etc.

[3] Ep. 40 *G.* With these letters of Cosmas and of Theodore of Jerusalem and the rest, compare the synodical letter of Theodore of Jerusalem, read in the third session of the Seventh General Council. (*Cf.* Héfélé, *Councils*, Eng. trans., v. §§ 340 and 345.)

[4] *Cf.* notices of synods held by each of the above-named three patriarchs, ap. Theoph., *Chron.*, ad an. 755. Vid. *sup.*, p. 354.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sent to Pope Paul first by Cosmas, and then by the united East.

Christopher and his son leave Rome.

Retribution for his violence and deceit was all this while being prepared for Constantine. Christopher, the primicerius of the notaries, and his son Sergius, treasurer of the Church, had, at the outset of the antipope's usurpation, made some show of resistance. Finding, however, that their lives were in danger, they soon gave it up and fled for their lives to St. Peter's. When the first violence of the outbreak had passed away, the two officials, "who preferred [1] to die rather than witness the success of such impious presumption" on the part of the antipope, came to a secret understanding with others within the city of a like mind to themselves. They then feigned a great desire to enter a monastery, and begged Constantine, with the greatest humility, to allow them to leave the city and become monks in the monastery of Our Saviour, near Rieti, in the duchy of Spoleto. Exacting an oath from them that such was their intention in leaving the city, Constantine gave them the required permission. Once outside the city (after April 10, 768), the two thought no more of their oath, but went straight to Theodicius, Duke of Spoleto, and begged him to take them to his sovereign,[2] Desiderius. In answer to their prayers that he would bring to a close the scandal which was afflicting the Church, Desiderius gave orders that they should receive the support of the Lombards. In conjunction with a Lombard priest, Waldipert, Sergius marched on Rome with a force of Lombards from the duchy of Spoleto. Admitted into the city by his friends at the gate of St. Pancratius (July 30, 768), Sergius and

Sergius enters Rome with a Lombard army.

[1] *L. P.*, and *Conc. Lat.*

[2] *L. P.* in vit. Steph. IV. "Adjurantes . . . . ut eos . . . . ad Desiderium *suum* deduceret Regem Longobardorum." Had Theodicius returned to the allegiance of the Lombard king?

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his party seized the walls, but were, or pretended to be, afraid to descend the Janiculum.

As soon as he heard of the entry of the Lombards, Toto hastened to meet them, along with Demetrius, the secundicerius, and Gratiosus, the chartular, afterwards duke, who were secretly in league with Sergius. Seeing Toto strike down one Rachipert, the most formidable of their number, the Lombards would have fled, had not Toto himself fallen, pierced through by Demetrius and Gratiosus. On the death of the daring Toto, his brother Passivus fled to warn Constantine to fly ere it was too late. The two brothers rushed from one part of the Lateran to another, and finally shut themselves up in the oratory of St. Cesarius. Here, after some hours, they were discovered. Dragged thence, they were thrown into prison by the officers of the Roman army.[1]

A second antipope.

Matters now took an unexpected turn. Unknown to Sergius, and doubtless with the intention of getting a Pope favourable to his master, Waldipert collected a number of Romans (*aliquantos Romanos*), went to the monastery of St. Vitus on the Esquiline, took thence a priest named Philip, declared that St. Peter had chosen him Pope, and conducted him (July 31, Sunday) to the Lateran basilica. Here, after the prescribed prayers had been said by a bishop, Philip proceeded to hold the customary banquet in the Lateran palace, at which assisted a certain number of the dignitaries[2] of the Church and State. But, like

[1] "Romanæ militiæ judices." All this direct from the *L. P.*

[2] "Primates ecclesiæ, et optimates militiæ"—still the *L. P.* The whole of this passage is very interesting as showing the order of events after the election of a Pope and his introduction to the Lateran palace 'more solito.' "Illicque oratione ab Episcopo data juxta antiquitatis morem, tribuensque pacem omnibus, in Lateranense introduxerunt Patriarchio. Et ibidem similiter in Pontificalem sellam sedens, tribuensque denuo, ut mos est, pacem, ascendit sursum et mensam, ut assolent pontifices, tenuit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Baltazzar, Philip was condemned whilst at the feast. Christopher had meanwhile arrived before the city gates, and, hearing of the election of Philip (so far irregular that he was not one of the *cardinal* priests or deacons from whom the popes were wont at this time to be chosen), declared on oath to all the Romans who had gone out to meet him that he would not enter the city till Philip was driven from the palace. Philip did not require much driving. He quietly returned to his own monastery.

Election of Stephen, Aug. 768.

The first care of Christopher was to bring about a lawful election. Accordingly he summoned (August 1, 768) not only the chief men among the clergy and the army, but everybody, "from the greatest to the smallest." They met together in front of the Church of St. Adriano, a spot called, by the *Book of the Popes*, 'in tribus Fatis,' from statues of the three Fates which stood near. It was that part of the Forum known as the 'Comitium,' where of old the 'Comitia Curiata' held their deliberations. On this historic ground the Romans unanimously resolved to elect Stephen. Going to his church of Sta. Cecilia in Trastevere, they escorted him with every demonstration of joy to the Lateran as Pope-elect.[1] Thus closed one of the first of those struggles between the ecclesiastical and secular nobility of the new papal state, which were destined to last so long and to bring at times, through the too frequent triumph of the secular nobility, especially in the tenth century, so much disgrace on the Papacy and the Church. As the troubles caused the Papacy at this period by its external foes—Greeks and Lombards—were decreasing, those caused by its enemies at home were destined to

[1] *L. P.* This designation (in tr. Fatis) of the north corner of the Roman Forum is very ancient. Pliny (*H. N.*, xxxiv. 11) speaks of three statues of the Sibyls near the Rostrum, and St. Cyprian (ep. 21) uses the appellation itself (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 481).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

increase. The latter evil was, however, the lesser. The foes at home only aimed at seizing the papal dignity; those abroad aimed not merely at the persons of the popes, but, the Greeks at least, at their principles.

Character and early career of Stephen.

The man thus elected was a Sicilian and the son of Olivus; and, according to his biographer at least, was a man of strong character, well versed in Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition, and a doer of good works. When he came to Rome from Sicily, Pope Gregory III. placed him in his monastery of St. Chrysogonus, where he became a cleric and a Benedictine monk. As he was only a child (*parvulus*) under Gregory, he must have been born about the year 720. Hence when he became Pope he must have been about fifty. He was taken from the monastery by Pope Zachary, who ordained him priest, and, charmed with his modesty, kept him in his immediate service in the Lateran. For the same reason he also found favour with Zachary's successors; and, as was noted above, he remained by the bedside of the dying Pope Paul when all others through fear had left him.

Savage cruelties practised on the antipope's followers.

During the interval between Stephen's election and consecration, there were perpetrated a series of revolting deeds of cruelty. The cause of this outbreak of wild revenge is hard to trace. The history of Rome in the Middle Ages has not, up to this time, as far at least as we know it from the sources at our disposal, revealed any such traces of lawlessness as would have prepared us to expect the scenes of blood we have now to portray. We may, therefore, presume that they are evidence either that the unceasing conflicts with the Lombards had caused a gradual decline of morality in the city, or that they were the results of civil strife, rendered more sanguinary than usual from some more or less accidental cause. Civil strife is ever waged more cruelly than any other. And if

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

one side gives the slightest exhibition of extra cruelty, then such passions are set ablaze that no act of barbarity seems too diabolical for either side to think out and to put into execution. We shall give the account of these outrages practically in the very words of Stephen's biographer, so that the reader may judge whether there is the very slightest foundation for the conclusion of Gregorovius[1] that Stephen 'did not seek to prevent' these horrors, meaning, thereby, we take it, that he connived at them.

Whilst that most holy man (Stephen) was still but Pope-elect, says the papal biographer, there was gathered together a band of men who had before their eyes neither the fear of God nor His terrible judgment, in obedience to the orders of certain wicked wretches, whom God's just retribution has overtaken.[2] The gang began by seizing Bishop Theodore, Constantine's vicedominus, and depriving him of his eyes and tongue. Passivus was also deprived of his eyes. The houses of both the unfortunate men were plundered, and Theodore, thrust 'into the monastery of Clivus Scaurus'—the monastery, it would seem, that was founded by St. Gregory I. on the site of his paternal house —was left to die of hunger and thirst.[3] The antipope Constantine was driven through the city in mockery on horseback, seated on a woman's saddle, with heavy weights attached to his feet, and then lodged in a monastery near the Church of Sta. Saba on the Aventine. This church, from the fact of its being, along with the monastery adjoining,

[1] *Rome*, etc., ii. 329.

[2] This contrast between Stephen and the 'aliquanti perversi' is quite enough to show that to the mind at least of the Pope's biographer, Stephen had no direct or indirect connection with the atrocities his biographer goes on to enumerate. It may here be observed that 'aliquanti Romani' were always to be had throughout the whole of the Middle Ages for any purpose whatsoever.

[3] "Clamansque aquam!" *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the first asylum of the Greek (Basilian) monks in Rome, was known as 'ad Cellam *novam*.'[1] Thence he was taken (August 6) to the Lateran basilica, and canonically degraded.[2] His pallium was cast at his feet by a subdeacon, and his shoes, the special ones worn by a Pope, cut off!

Consecration of Stephen, Aug. 7, 768.

The next day Stephen was consecrated in St. Peter's; and by the mouth of Leontius, one of the papal secretaries, the people confessed their guilt for not resisting the antipope.

Further cruelties.

Unfortunately the consecration of Stephen did not put an end to the violence that was being perpetrated in the name of justice. One of the towns of the Campagna, which one of the MS.[3] of the *Liber Pontificalis* sets down as Alatri, a mountain town not far from Anagni, and which its ancient lords, the Hernicians, boasted to have been built by Saturn, held out for the antipope Constantine. Its governor, the 'tribune' Gracilis, as he is described in the *Book of the Popes*—a title which, like 'consul,' was at this period a *nomen sine re*—relying on the natural and artificial strength of his position, considered he was safe in defying the new power, and commenced to ravage the Campagna. He was mistaken, however. His stronghold was stormed by a force of Romans,[4] Tuscans, and troops from various parts of the Campagna, and he himself taken prisoner to Rome. From his prison he was ruthlessly dragged by certain "wicked Campanians, ... who

[1] Hence the *L. P.*, "in monasterio Cellanovas . . . . deportatus est."

[2] *Ib.* "Lectisque sacratissimis Canonibus ita depositus est; accedens enim . . . . subdiaconus orarium de ejus collo abstulit et ante pedes ejus projecit."

[3] *Cf.* Muratori's ed. of *L. P.*, ap. *R. I. S.*, and Duchesne's.

[4] "Aggregati universi exercitus Romanæ civitatis, et Tusciæ et Campaniæ . . . . constringentes fortiter . . . . civitatem, ipsum exinde abstulerunt Gracilem." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

were urged on by some most impious men more wicked than themselves,"[1] and deprived of his eyes and tongue.

A few days after, these same strangers, with the approval of the chartular Gratiosus,[2] and his chief officers, "by whose authority these terrible deeds were done," dragged the unfortunate Constantine from his monastic prison, early in the morning, put out his eyes, and left him lying in the street.

Finally, on a charge of conspiring to kill the primicerius, Christopher and other nobles, and to hand over the city to the Lombards, orders were issued to arrest the Lombard priest Waldipert. The poor priest fled to the Church of Our Lady *ad Martyres*, or the Pantheon. Thence, still clinging to Our Lady's image, Waldipert was drawn, and so cruelly was the usual brutal work of blinding performed that he soon died.[3]

While gladly finishing with these deeds of blood, we would observe that the only one whom history in any way connects with them, as a responsible agent, is the chartular Gratiosus. Stephen is represented as merely passive.

The Lateran Council, 769.

In the very outset of his pontificate, Stephen had sent to inform Pippin and his two sons, Charlemagne and Carlomann, of his election. He begged them to send to Rome bishops learned in the Scriptures and in canon law to assist at a synod which would take steps to prevent the repetition of such a usurpation of the Holy See as had just been perpetrated.[4] On their arrival in France, the papal envoys found that the great king Pippin was no more. He had died September 24, 768, and Charlemagne and Carlomann were reigning in

[1] *L. P.*

[2] "Tuscani et Campani . . . . inito consilio cum Gratioso et fortioribus ejus, per quorum auctoritatem tanta mala operabantur, perrexerunt," etc. *L. P.* Does this passage imply that Gratiosus was responsible for all these atrocious doings?

[3] *Ib.*

[4] *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his stead. The two kings gladly responded to Stephen's wishes, and twelve of their bishops set out for Rome.

In April (769) the Pope opened a synod in the Lateran basilica of some fifty bishops, and a considerable number of the inferior clergy and of the laity. The first work to which the council turned its attention was that of examining into the doings of the antipope. The blind Constantine was introduced, and was asked how he had ventured, being a layman, to intrude himself into the Apostolic See and be guilty of such an unheard-of impiety. In reply, Constantine urged that he had acted under compulsion, inasmuch as the people hoped thus for a remedy from the evils that Pope Paul had brought upon them. Then he threw himself on the ground, confessed that he had sinned, and begged the synod to forgive him. At the second day's examination, however, Constantine was by no means so submissive, but argued that he had done nothing new. This barefaced attempt to defend his usurpation was more than the assembly could endure. They[1] ordered him to be beaten and cast forth from the Church. Then the acts of the antipope were publicly burnt before the whole synod, and the Pope and the bishops, along with the Roman laity, prostrated themselves, sang the 'Kyrie eleison' and declared that they had sinned in receiving Holy Communion at the hands of Constantine. After the imposition of a suitable penance, and after a careful discussion on the canons, it was decreed, under pain of

[1] "Irati zelo ecclesiasticæ traditionis universi sacerdotes alapis ejus cervicem cædere facientes eum extra ecclesiam ejecerunt." *L. P.* Of course Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. 330) and Milman (*Hist. Lat.*, etc., iii. 33) do not hesitate to affirm that it was the clergy themselves that struck Constantine. But there can be no doubt that 'cædere facientes' means 'to cause to be struck.' Hence one reading has 'cedi' (*L. P.*, i. 475); *cf.* 'interficere facientes' of this very council, ap. Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 480.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

interdict, that no layman could be made Pope, and that only cardinal deacons or priests, who had passed through the minor orders, were to be eligible for the honour of the papacy.[1] The laity, moreover, were forbidden any share in the election for the future;[2] express prohibition being urged against the presence of armed men, and of the troops from Tuscany and the Campagna. But when the election had been held by the clergy, the Roman army and people were to salute the elect before he was escorted to the Lateran Palace.

Decrees were next passed with regard to the ordinations held by the antipope. It was decided that the bishops, priests, and deacons whom he had ordained were to again rank only from the degree from which the antipope had raised them. However, if those who had been consecrated bishops were re-elected in the ordinary canonical way, they might be reconciled and restored[3] to the episcopal grade by the Pope. In the same way he might reinstate the priests and deacons. But such laymen as had been ordained priests or deacons by Constantine had to do penance in the religious habit all their lives, and none of those whom the antipope had ordained were ever to be promoted to a higher grade. These stringent regulations were made with the very desirable object of preventing the recurrence

[1] "Ne ullus præsumat laïcorum, neque ex alio ordine, nisi per distinctos gradus ascendens, diaconus aut presbyter cardinalis factus fuerit, ad sacrum Pontificatus honorem possit promoveri." *L. P.* In this passage we meet with the word 'cardinal' for the first time in the *L. P.*

[2] "Sed a certis sacerdotibus atque proceribus ecclesiæ et cuncto clero ipsa pontificalis electio proveniat" (*Conc. Lat.*).

[3] Not *reconsecrated* in the ordinary sense. Hence the *L. P.* says that such re-elected prelates "*benedictionis* susciperent consecrationem." From Auxilius (*De ordin.*, i. c. 4, ap. Migne, t. 129, p. 1080) it would perhaps appear, however, that they were actually reconsecrated; but the state of the case is obscure.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"of such[1] impious novelties in the Church of God." The bishops who had been consecrated by Constantine seem to have been all reconciled by the Pope. But Stephen would never re-establish the priests or deacons in the rank to which the antipope had raised them. Furthermore, in general, the sacraments which Constantine had administered, except baptism and confirmation (*sanctum chrisma*), were to be repeated.

Finally, after a careful examination of various testimonies of the Fathers, it was decreed that holy images[2] had to be venerated by all Christians; and the late synod of Constantinople (754) against the sacred images was anathematized.[3]

When the business of the council was over, a great procession of the clergy and people, all barefooted, was made to St. Peter's. There the decrees of the council were solemnly announced to all, as well as the anathemas to which any who dared to violate them were exposed.[4] It was the wholesale disregard of the decrees of this council in the matter of papal elections that some two centuries later reduced the Papacy to its lowest level.

Usurpation at Ravenna 770.

The example of violent interference with canonical election offered in the case of Stephen was not long in

[1] "Ne talis impius novitatis error in Ecclesia Dei pullularet." *L. P.*

[2] "Statuerunt magno honoris affectu ab omnibus Christianis ipsas sacras venerari imagines." *Ib.*

[3] On the decrees of this synod, *cf. The Lateran Council*, ap. Mansi, xii; Jaffé, *Regesta*, ad an. 769; *L. P.* in vit.; and Héfélé, *Conc.*, Eng. trans., v. § 343. By way of a practical protest against Iconoclasm, Stephen, like the other popes of this period, increased the number of holy images in the churches, erecting special places for their accommodation. "Fecit enim et tres regulares super rugas . . . . ubi imagines in frontispicio constitutæ sunt." *L. P.* Ducange is not certain as to the exact meaning of 'regulares' and 'rugæ.' It would seem that the erections were screens, like our rood-screens, with hanging curtains.

[4] *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

being followed. On the death of Sergius, Archbishop of Ravenna (770), the archdeacon Leo was duly elected to succeed him. But Michael, a lay secretary[1] of the Church, procuring the connivance of Desiderius, the Lombard king, who was, of course, not averse to promoting trouble in the Pope's dominions, and the armed assistance of Maurice, Duke of Rimini, got himself elected by force. Leo was safely imprisoned by Maurice in his ducal city; and the two conspirators, with the, probably enforced, co-operation of the 'judges' (*judices*) of Ravenna, at once sent to offer the Pope large sums of money if he would consecrate Michael. This Stephen refused to do on any account, and sent both letters and envoys to induce Michael to withdraw. For a time, a year and more, the usurper was able to set the Pope at defiance—the ornaments of the cathedral and the episcopal palace supplying him with the means of buying the support of Desiderius. But at length Stephen, taking advantage of the presence in Rome of one of Charlemagne's envoys, Hucbald, sent him to Ravenna along with his own legates. Emboldened by the appearance of the Frankish ambassador, the party of law and order took courage, rose, sent Michael in chains to Rome, and reasserted the rights of Leo. Accompanied by a large number of his clergy, Leo at once went to Rome, where he was consecrated bishop by the Pope.[2]

Charlemagne and Desiderata, 769-770.

The short pontificate of Stephen IV. brought him many serious troubles from first one quarter and then another. Whilst the difficulties at Ravenna were still unsettled, Stephen was filled with fear lest the mortal enemies of the popes, the Lombards, might gain a solid advantage over him from a new line of policy suddenly developed by

[1] *L. P.* "Scrinarius . . . . qui nullo sacerdotali fungebatur honore."

[2] With the account in the *L. P.*, compare the confirmatory evidence in one of Pope Hadrian's letters. (*Cod. C.*, 88 *J.*; 85 *G.*)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Desiderius. This affair, which touches on Charlemagne's wives,[1] is involved in no little obscurity for that very reason, as well as from the ever-recurring difficulty of the want of dates to the letters in the Caroline Code. To writers with theories, of course, nothing presents a difficulty. From our ignorance of many crucial facts and dates, the reigns of many of the popes simply present to the writer a mass of facts, like so many pieces of coloured marbles, out of which each man can make a mosaic for himself according to his own design. We will endeavour to give the facts of the case so that the reader may judge of their bearings for himself.

Pippin, as we have said, was succeeded by his sons, Charles (Charlemagne) and Carlomann. If we can rely upon Andrew of Bergamo, who wrote a century after this, the elder brother, Carlomann, was a man of savage temper.[2] At any rate, whatever the cause, there was no love lost

The brothers.

[1] With regard to Charlemagne's wives, it is certain that he had a considerable number, apparently nine; and it seems that he had a number of concubines, though it has been maintained (see, *e.g.*, *Revue Cath.*, 1868, p. 497 *seq.*, Louvain) that the latter were simply morganatic wives. And though the history of these wives cannot be said to be strictly ascertained, it does not seem that they were all his lawfully from a Christian point of view; that is, on the understanding that divorce and bigamy are unlawful. Perhaps, to judge from the laxity of certain canons of the councils of Verberie (753) and Compiègne (757) in the matter of the marriage laws, Charlemagne may have thought that the laws of the Church allowed him to divorce his wives in certain cases. Some moderns say that Desiderata is also sometimes called Bertha. A writer in the *Eng. Hist. Rev.* (Jan. 1900) suggests that Bertha, the name given to her by Creontius and Andrew of Bergamo, was probably assumed on her marriage, as a Latin name would not be thought fit for a Frankish queen. This but adds another to the already very numerous, *possibly* well-founded, conjectures which have been devised in connection with this whole affair! As a matter of fact, it is not certain what was the name of the daughter of Desiderius; the best authorities only speak of her as 'the daughter of Desiderius.'

[2] *Hist.*, c. 3 (ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*), Carol. "ferebundus et pessimus."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

between the brothers; and the tension between them, while it brought the greatest anxiety to their mother and to the Pope, would, of course, be viewed with complacency by Desiderius. By the efforts of those, the Pope among them, who wished the brothers well, some measure of harmony was established between them, perhaps in 769. In a letter[1] to "Charles and Carlomann, kings of the Franks and patricians of the Romans," in which Stephen expressed his pleasure at the good news which they had sent him regarding their reconciliation, and their firm intention to stand by the promises which, with their father, they had made to the vicars of St. Peter, he begged them to fulfil their engagements, to see to the full restoration of the *justitiæ* of St. Peter, and not to believe any story to the effect that he had already received them.

Frankish embassy to Desiderius, 770.

Accordingly, in prompt compliance with Stephen's request, an embassy was despatched by the Frankish kings to put pressure upon the Lombard monarch Desiderius. One of the envoys was Ittherius, Charlemagne's chancellor, and apparently with them went Bertrada (Bertha), his mother.[2] That the *missi* were at least partially successful in their errand is certain, not only from contemporary chronicles, but from a letter of the Pope to Bertrada and her son, in which he commends to them the exertions of Ittherius in obtaining the restitution of the Beneventan patrimony.[3]

But the envoys, and the queen-mother particularly, had

[1] *Cod. C.*, ep. 44 *G.*, belonging to 769 or 770. "Exigere a Langobardis jubeatis . . . . ut sua propria isdem princeps App. atque S. Romana rei publice ecclesia recipiat."

[2] *Ann. Moissiac.*, an. 770. "Berta . . . . in Italia ad placitum contra Desiderium regem; et redditæ sunt civitates plurimæ ad partem S. Petri, et Berta adduxit filiam Desiderii in Franciam." *Cf. Ann. Petav.*, an. 770, also ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.; and *Ann. Mosellani*, ap. *ib.*, xvi.

[3] Ep. 46 *G.*, an. 770 or 771.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

another end in view besides furthering the cause of peace between Desiderius and the Pope. She went to Italy, indeed, "for the sake of peace,"[1] but she went also "on account of the daughter of King Desiderius."[2] Her *rôle* in this matter of the 'daughter of King Desiderius' has, we believe, been much exaggerated by some modern authors. She has been represented as its prime mover, and as acting from the highest political motives. That she was not its prime mover would seem to be proved by the letter of Pope Stephen, soon to be quoted. This letter must be regarded as the most important authority on this matter —the more so that there is nothing to oppose to its statements. However, when "she had finished the business for which she came to Italy, and paid her devotions at the shrines of the Apostles at Rome, she returned to her sons in Gaul."[3] Let us hear what the business 'of the daughter of King Desiderius' was.

Perhaps in the year 769, at any rate early in 770, *Desiderius* proposed that his daughter should marry one or other of the Frank kings,[4] doubtless with the view of attaching them to himself and alienating them from the Pope. Tassilo of Bavaria was already his son-in-law. He would do well if he could make one of the Frankish kings another. It appears to have been also proposed to give the little Gisela to Adelchis, the son of Desiderius.

When Stephen heard of this proposal, he was naturally alarmed and shocked, for both the young kings were already married.[5] He at once, therefore, wrote to them. After

[1] *Ann. Lauris., et Ann. Einhard*, ann. 770. "Pacis causa."

[2] *Ann. Petav., l.c.* [3] *Ann. Laur.* and *Einh., l.c.*

[4] Ep. Steph., ap. *Cod. C.*, 45 *G.* "*Desiderius* vestram persuadere dignoscitur excellentiam, suam filiam uni ex vestra fraternitate in conuvio opulari," ed. *J.* 47.

[5] From passages soon to be quoted from this letter (ep. 45 *G.*), there cannot be the slightest doubt that Charlemagne, as well as Carlomann,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

warning them that they must be on their guard, because the devil is ever on the watch to get the better of us by assailing us on our weak side, just as he ruined Adam through the feebler nature of a woman, he proceeds to say that noble Franks ought not to dream of uniting themselves with Lombards, who are such a loathsome people, as the fact of the lepers originating from them shows.[1] If that is the case with the nation of the Franks in general, how much less ought you two kings to unite with Lombards, "you who are already, by the will of God and the commands of your father, lawfully married to noble wives of your own nation, whom you are bound to cherish.[2] And certainly it is not lawful for you to put away the wives you have and marry others, or ally yourselves in marriage with a foreign people, a thing never done by any of your ancestors. . . . It is wicked of you even to entertain the thought of marrying again when you are already married. You ought not to act thus, who profess to follow the law of God, and punish others to prevent men acting in this unlawful manner. Such things do the heathen. But they ought not to be done by you who are Christians, 'a holy people and a kingly priesthood.'" Stephen then uses other arguments. He reminds the two young kings that their father Pippin, at the exhortation of Pope Stephen, his pre-

was at this time really married, whatever conclusions some are inclined to draw from Eginhard to the contrary.

[1] That there were lepers among the Lombards, the laws of Rothari (*e.g.*, 176), by legislating for them, prove. And when we reflect that lepers are still to be found among the Scandinavian peoples, it may easily be that the Lombard barbarians brought, at least, a great increase of lepers into Italy. Writers who are so ready to blame the strong language of this letter forget how despicable the Lombards really were—the worst and lowest of the barbaric invaders of the empire.

[2] "Jam Dei voluntate et consilio, conjugio legitimo, ex præceptione genitoris vestri copulati estis, accipientes, de eadem vestra patria . . . . pulcherrimas conjuges, et eorum vos oportet amori esse adnexos." *Cod. C.*, ep. 45 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

decessor, refrained from putting away their mother; that they had promised the same Pope that they would ever count his friends and enemies theirs also; and that their father, at the wish of the Pope, refused to give his daughter Gisela even to the son of the emperor Constantine, and had with them promised obedience and love to the Pope. In conclusion he exhorts them by the living God and His dreadful judgment, and by the body of St. Peter, not to wed the daughter of Desiderius, nor "to dare to put away their wives,"[1] and not to give their sister Gisela to the son of Desiderius; but, on the contrary, mindful of what they had promised to St. Peter, to resist the Lombards and force them to fulfil the promises they had made to restore the rights of the Church. For so far from keeping their word, the Lombards never cease to oppress the Church. "This letter, after having placed it on the *Confession* of St. Peter, and celebrated the holy sacrifice over it, we are sending to you with tears. But know that if anyone, which God forbid, should contravene this letter, he is excommunicated and given over to eternal flames with the devil and the wicked."[2]

For some cause or other the proposal of the Lombard king recommended itself to the queen-mother, Bertrada (Bertha). In the course of the year 770,[3] as we have seen,

[1] "Nec vestras quoquo modo conjuges audeatis dimittere" (*ib.*).

[2] *Ib.* Some authors, more anxious to fasten on certain phrases in this letter which sound somewhat coarse or harsh to modern ears, but which the rougher minds of the men of those days, as well as the occasion, may well excuse, if not justify, fail altogether to present to their readers a true idea of the Pope's letter. (*Cf.* Gregorovius, *Rome*, etc., ii. 338; *Hist. of Charlemagne*, by G. P. R. James. The language of the latter (p. 130) is simply ridiculous in its exaggeration.) The formula of anathema with which this letter concludes is the one in general use at this period, and is, indeed, much the same as that used at present.

[3] *Cf. Chron. Moissiac.*, 700, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.; *Annal. Fuldenses*, etc.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

she came to Italy to escort Desiderata to France. The young kings Charlemagne and Carlomann were, we have already noted, anything but perfectly united, and had it not been for the forbearance of Charlemagne, there would have been war between them. Bertrada *may* have argued that if their thoughts could be turned 'to marriage and giving in marriage,' war between them would be averted. Or perhaps her object may have been to get an ally for Charlemagne (to whom she seems to have been more attached) in the event of war between the two brothers, just as it was doubtless the object of Desiderius to attach to himself one of the brothers—he did not mind which—and then foment trouble between them and weaken both of them. To say the least of it, these conjectures are perhaps as likely to be true as the many others put forward in this connection. And though she failed to induce Gisela to marry the son of Desiderius, or Carlomann to marry his daughter, she succeeded in persuading[1] Charlemagne to marry Desiderata. When exactly the marriage took place we do not know. At any rate, in less than a year Charlemagne divorced her, for some cause unknown even to Eginhard, and to the great chagrin of his mother.[2] If Andrew of Bergamo could be safely quoted as an authority on this point, what has been said of Bertha's wish to secure an ally for Charlemagne would receive no little support. He avers (c. 3) that it was Carlomann who forced his brother to repudiate Desiderata! Withal, it is as likely as not that the remonstrances of the Pope prevailed in the end.

The downfall of Christopher and Sergius (Lent, 770 or 771).

Probably whilst Charlemagne was still united with Desiderata, Stephen had another and more serious

[1] Eginhard *in vit. Car.*, c. 18, Eng. trans., p. 65. *Ann. Fuld.*, an. 770. "Berhta filiam Desiderii, Karolo conjugio sociandam de Italia adduxit."

[2] *Ib.*, pp. 66–7. *Cf.* Vit. Adalhard, c. 7, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

difficulty to face, and a difficulty that is to us now more involved in obscurities than the marriage question of Charlemagne. To begin with, we will narrate the affair as it appears in the contemporary author in the *Liber Pontificalis*, noting how far his story is supported by the words of the Bavarian envoy, the secretary of Tassilo III., the so-called Creontius or Crantz.

Christopher and his son Sergius, who had been the prime movers in Stephen's elevation to the popedom, continued to be his right-hand men after his consecration. By their advice every effort was made through Charlemagne and Carlomann to force Desiderius to surrender various rights (*justitiæ*) belonging to the Holy See in different parts of Italy over which the Lombard had control, and which he had repeatedly promised to restore. Christopher was certainly a masterful man. So boldly did he fulfil his mission to Constantine, that the emperor expressed his belief that the envoy must have exceeded his commission; and we have seen how, in the election of Stephen, he thwarted the designs, first of the rough noble Toto and then of the Lombard Waldipert. Convinced, then, that Sergius and his father were his ablest opponents, and inflamed with anger[1] against them, Desiderius resolved to destroy them. He accordingly managed to buy the tongues of the Pope's chamberlain, Paul Afiarta, and others, and directed them to be used in blackening the characters of Christopher and Sergius before the Pope.[2] Then he gave out that he intended to go to Rome to offer up prayers to St. Peter. But Sergius and his father

[1] *L. P.* "Unde nimia furoris indignatione contra prænominatos," etc. *Cf.* Creontius, ap. Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 484. "Desiderius . . . . Christophorum Romanum, prudentissimum virum . . . . dolo capturus."

[2] "Dirigens clam munera Paulo . . . . simulavit (Desiderius) se quasi orationis causa . . . . Romam properaturum." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

were not easily deceived. They straightway collected troops, closed the gates of the city, and made all the necessary preparations for resistance. When Desiderius and his army arrived before the city, he sent to the Pope to request an interview. To this Stephen agreed, and after a conference on the *justitiæ*, returned to the city.[1] In his absence Paul Afiarta and his party had endeavoured to raise the people against Christopher and his son. But these leaders were ready and attacked their opponents, who seemed to have fled to the Lateran palace. Thither the victorious party pursued them, following them even into the Pope's presence in the basilica of Pope Theodore. It was apparently at this juncture that, according to the Bavarian, the Pope was forced "to take an oath to be true to Christopher and Sergius, as they suspected him of having come to an understanding with the enemy." They knew Desiderius' hatred of them, and they feared that in his interview with the Pope he might have put pressure upon him to give them up. To resume from the biographer of Stephen. Indignant at this violation of his rights and person, Stephen soundly rated the attacking party and ordered them to withdraw, an order which they immediately obeyed. The next day the Pope again went out to St. Peter's, which was at this time outside the walls of the city, to have another conference with the false Lombard. Creontius speaks of this as a flight (*fugit*), and goes on to say that the Pope and the king again conspired against Christopher, endeavoured by threats,

[1] The more easily to make headway with the Pope, Desiderius promised that he would give the Pope complete satisfaction in this matter. Needless to say, Stephen had to complain of his faithlessness! "Stephanus de fraudulenta ejus (Desiderii) fide referuit, inquiens quod omnia illi mentitus fuisset quæ ei . . . . promisit pro justitiis." *L. P.* in vit. Hadriani.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

money and every means to turn the people against him, and threatened to destroy the city unless he were given up.

Following the *Liber Pontificalis*, Stephen left the city to continue the discussion on the 'claims' of St. Peter; but Desiderius would not again discuss the question of the usurped 'rights'[1] (*justitiæ*) of the Holy See, but only what he was pleased to call the treachery of Christopher and Sergius towards the Pope. It would then appear that, failing to make any impression on the Pope with words, in violation of all the sacred rights of ambassadors, he had recourse to violence. For the papal biographer goes on to relate that Desiderius imprisoned the Pope and his suite in St. Peter's by closing all the gates, and that *then* the Pope sent two bishops to parley with Christopher and Sergius, and to tell them that they must either retire to a monastery or come out to him at St. Peter's. According to the Bavarian, the bishops cried: "Pope Stephen bids you not to fight against your brethren, but to expel Christopher from the city, and save it, yourselves, and your children." He adds that Christopher was at once given up in chains. It may be noted, in passing, that the testimony of 'Creontius' cannot be said to be of the same value as that of the *Book of the Popes*, as it is impossible to tell from the work of Aventinus precisely how much is from the pen of the sixteenth century German and how much from the eighth. This message, clearly, as it seems to us,[2]

[1] "Prætermittens Desiderius causas de justitiis b. Petri tantummodo pro deceptione Christ. et Sergii insistebat. Unde claudens universas januas b. Petri, neminem Romanorum, qui cum ipso s. Pontifice exierant, ex eadem ecclesia egredi permisit. Tunc direxit ipse almificus," etc. *L. P.*

[2] The account of this affair in Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. p. 334) is very largely supplemented from the author's imagination. By

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

dictated by Desiderius, naturally caused distrust to arise among the adherents of Christopher and Sergius. Their followers rapidly fell away from them, and, though at first they were loath to leave the city, first son and then father betook themselves to the Pope during the night. Next day the Pope returned, or was allowed to return, to the city, leaving, doubtless because he had no choice in the matter, Christopher and Sergius in St. Peter's, but hoping[1] to be able to find some means of bringing them back to Rome by night. From the Bavarian narrative we learn that during this eventful day the superiors of the monasteries near St. Peter's, who went thither to try to obtain mercy for Christopher and his son, were not only completely unsuccessful in their mission, but were even maltreated by the Lombards. Before night arrived, Paul and his party, after arranging[2] matters with Desiderius, seized the unfortunate pair and put out their eyes. The father died after three days in the monastery of St. Agatha in Trastevere, but Sergius lingered on in a cell of the Lateran. "All these evils,"[3] concludes the papal biographer, "were brought about by the machinations of Desiderius, the king of the Lombards." Such is the clear and consistent narrative of these events in the *Book of the Popes*; and it is, in its principal features, corroborated by what can be

placing the affair of Charlemagne and Desiderata after these events, he is also wrong in his chronology. The Pope's letter on the subject of the marriage supposes that Sergius is still alive and acting for the Pope. *Cf.* Jaffé, *Regest.*, sub. ann. 771.

[1] "Cupiens eos noctis silentio propter insidias inimicorum salvos introduci Romam." *L. P.* Twice the biographer asserts the Pope's wish to save the lives of Christopher and Sergius.

[2] "Inientesque cum eo (Desiderio) impium consilium." *Ib.*

[3] "Hæc omnia mala per iniquas immisiones Longobardorum Desiderii Regis provenerunt." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

gathered from John Turmair of the report of Tassilo's secretary.

Had we no further materials than the *Liber Pontificalis* supplies us with, we might be said to have an easily intelligible account of the downfall of Christopher and Sergius. But there exists in the Caroline Code a letter[1] from the Pope, addressed to Queen Bertrada and Charlemagne, which gives a very different account of the part played by Desiderius. In that letter, those 'most wicked men,' Christopher and Sergius, are represented as having come to an understanding with Dodo, the envoy of Carlomann, and as having attempted to kill the Pope. By good fortune, Stephen managed to escape to Desiderius, who happened to be at Rome at the time, as he had come to treat about the 'rights' of the Holy See. On the Pope's flight the city was barred against him. But by degrees, as the perfidy of Christopher became clearer, his party fell away from him, and at length, much against their will, Christopher and Sergius were brought out to the Pope. Stephen was, with difficulty, able to save their lives, "which the whole people were anxious to take,"[2] and whilst he was making arrangements to bring them back into the city during the night, "those who were ever on the watch for them" seized them and put out their eyes, "without our concurrence in any way." Stephen assures Charlemagne, in conclusion, that but for the help of God, and "his most excellent son Desiderius," he, his clergy, and his people would all have been in danger of death; that Dodo was to blame for the whole trouble, and that he had received from Desiderius[3]

Letter of Pope Stephen to Bertrada and Charlemagne, 771.

[1] *Cod. Car.*, 48, ap. *G.*; 50 *J.*

[2] "Quos interficere universus populus nitebantur." *Ib.*

[3] "Nobis convenit cum excellentissimo. . . . Desiderio, ... et omnes justitias b. Petri ab. eo plenius et in integro suscepimus." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

full satisfaction with regard to the 'rights' of the Church.

So improbable seem the statements in this letter, that many authors, "with some show of reason,"[1] have maintained that it was written by the Pope under compulsion, when he was in the hands of Desiderius. If the statements in this letter were true, it would mean that four men suddenly showed themselves false to the characters they had previously borne. Christopher and Sergius had, up to this time, proved themselves most devoted adherents of the popes. They had risked all they had in their service, had been duly appreciated[2] by them, and had done everything for Stephen himself. Dodo also had received warm praise as a friend of the popes; whereas, on the contrary, Desiderius, who both before and after these events showed himself anything but a friend of the popes, and had given abundant evidence of being a man of no character, a liar and a knave, is in this letter represented as the saviour of the Pope. If the letter were written under compulsion, its object is obvious. Dodo's name is dragged into it to foment discord between the two brothers, Charlemagne and Carlomann, an object we shall soon see Desiderius more openly working to bring about.

Of course it may have been that the calumnies of Afiarta and his friends did their work, and that the Pope

[1] Says even James, *History of Charlemagne*, p. 135, note.

[2] Pope Paul, in a letter (*Cod. C.*, ep. 36 *G.*) to Pippin, speaks of Christopher in the very highest terms. "Nostri prædecessoris ac germani . . . . simul et noster sincerus atque probatissimus fidelis extitit, et in omnibus existit, et satisfacti sumus de ejus immaculata fide et firma cordis constantia." Stephen himself had spoken (*Cod. C.*, ep. 45 *G.*) of Sergius as "fidelissimus noster"; and the same epithet was applied to Dodo by Paul (ep. 22 *G.*), if we may suppose him the same man as the Dodo in question.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

became suspicious of his two chief and powerful ministers. And as suspicion begets suspicion, it may have been that Christopher and his son began to mistrust the goodwill of the Pope towards them. Hence it may have been that Desiderius temporarily hoodwinked the Pope, and thus wrought his end in contriving the ruin of his able opponents. But of all these things, the reader,[1] now in possession of the facts of the case, must judge for himself.

It is quite certain that if the Pope had been deluded by Desiderius, the delusion did not last long. For when he sent to Desiderius to ask for the fulfilment of the promises he had made on oath over the body of St. Peter, he received this sarcastic answer: "Be content that I removed Christopher and Sergius, who were ruling you, out of your way, and ask not for 'rights.' Besides, if I do not continue to help you, great trouble will befall you. For Carlomann, king of the Franks, is the friend of Christopher and Sergius, and will be wishful to come to Rome and seize you."[2] Well might Pope Hadrian, who is our authority for this reply of Desiderius, add, "See of what value is the good faith of Desiderius!"

Paul Afiarta seems to have retained considerable power in the city. For as soon as Stephen was struck down with his last illness, he at once exiled a number of the most influential as well of the clergy as of the laity, and

[1] Not only did later authors of the Middle Ages set down the death of Christopher and his son 'to the craft' of Desiderius (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Odericus Vitalis in his sketch of this Pope's life), but, as we have seen, so also did the contemporary Creontius. So too, finally, it is certain, did Stephen, at least later on, sometime before his death. For he told Hadrian, who afterwards succeeded him, that their cruel treatment was all the work of Desiderius, and had been the cause of grave loss to him (Stephen). (*Cf. L. P.* in vit. Had.)

[2] *L. P.* in vit. Had. Pope Hadrian was told the above by Stephen himself.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

imprisoned others.[1] Moreover, as we shall see in the *Life* of Hadrian, eight days before Stephen died, the wretched Sergius was dragged forth from his place of confinement in the Lateran, by the orders of the same brutal chamberlain, and strangled. We shall also, with no little satisfaction, see, in the same place, that Paul, even in this life, reaped the just reward of his iniquity.

Desiderius makes trouble in Istria, 768–772.

To work out his purpose of subjecting all Italy to his sway, Desiderius caused trouble not only in Rome but in other places. We have seen[2] that it was decided that the bishop of Grado should be primate of Venetia and Istria. But Desiderius, correctly concluding that if the bishops of these provinces were subject to Aquileia instead, he would have more power over them, some time during Stephen's reign actively[3] employed himself in fomenting a schism in those parts. His efforts were crowned with success, and the bishops of Istria took it upon themselves to consecrate others without the consent of the patriarch of Grado. The patriarch accordingly appealed to the Pope. Stephen at once wrote to the rebellious bishops and to John of Grado himself. The bishops he suspended, and commanded to return to their obedience under pain of excommunication. John he consoled; and assured him, that, like his predecessor Stephen III., he would always consult the patriarch's interests; and that the subjects (*fideles*) of Blessed Peter would strive to defend Istria against its enemies, as they did to protect "our province[4] of Rome and

[1] *L. P.* in vit. Had. Hadrian recalled, we are told, "judices illos . . . . tam de clero, quam de militia, qui in exilium ad transitum D. Stephani P. missi fuerant a Paulo cubiculario."

[2] *Sup.*, p. 211.

[3] *Cf.* Dandolo in *Chron.*, ap. *R. I. S.*, xii.; Ughelli, *It. Sac.*, v.; Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 772.

[4] "Confidat sanctitas tua, quia fideles b. Petri — sicut hanc *nostram* Romanorum provinciam, et exarchatum Ravennatium, et

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the exarchate of Ravenna." To urge the Pope to adopt strong measures in support of the patriarch of Grado, Maurice, the doge of Venice, sent an embassy to Rome. But the death of Stephen prevented the negotiation from having any practical issue.

The seven cardinal bishops.

Before bringing this Pope's biography to a close, it is worth while mentioning that in the *Liber Pontificalis* he is said to have been a diligent observer of ecclesiastical tradition in the matter of church ceremonial. In connection with which, he decreed that every Sunday one of the seven 'cardinales hebomadarii,' now known as cardinal or suburbicarian bishops, should in turn say Mass in the Lateran on the altar of St. Peter, and should say at it the prayer 'Gloria in excelsis Deo.' From this weekly duty these 'cardinal bishops' (who are here mentioned for the first time) were called 'hebdomadarii.' The altar of St. Peter here spoken of is a table of wood, on which it is believed that St. Peter himself offered up the Holy Sacrifice; and which is enclosed at this day in the marble High Altar of the Lateran basilica. And to this day also, as in the other patriarchal basilicas,[1] only the Pope or a specially appointed cardinal can say Mass at the High Altar. A writer of the thirteenth century, John the Deacon,[2] enumerates these cardinal bishops as follows: "First is the bishop of Ostia, whose office it is to consecrate the Pope; then the bishops

ipsam quoque vestram provinciam pari modo ab inimicorum oppressionibus semper defendere procurent." Ep. ap. Dand., *Chron.* The appeal of John and both the letters of the Pope are also printed *M. G. H. Epp.*, iii. 711 f. To John of Grado the Pope is "omnium sacerdotalium præsulum summe pastor et domine, qui apostolorum principis Petri b. satis dignam contines fidem et vices," etc.

[1] The cardinal celebrants in these are cardinal priests.

[2] *De eccl. Lateran*, c. 8. A similar list of the seven 'hebdomadary' bishops, attached to the Lateran, had already been given by Peter Mallius in the first half of the preceding century (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 484).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of S. Rufina or Silvia Candida, Porto, Albano, Tusculum, Sabina and Prænestе. No doubt they were the same as were attached to the Lateran from the beginning. Nowadays there are six cardinal bishops. For in the beginning of the twelfth century, Porto and St. Rufina were united.

Death of Pope Stephen.

Stephen, whom some modern historians, with no little reason perhaps, call weak, and others, with no reason, call unscrupulous, died February 1st or 3rd, 772, and was buried in St. Peter's.

On the question as to whether or no Stephen was really a man of weak character, we may remark that he was not so indeed to his biographer, who, as we have already noticed, calls him a man of character (*vir strenuus*). He was much respected by his successor Hadrian, who is, on all hands, allowed to have been an exceptionally strong-minded man. And it may be urged that it is easy to call a man weak who has to give way before overwhelming odds. King Pippin, the great support of this Pope's predecessors, was dead. Pippin's successors, Charlemagne and Carlomann, were young, disunited, and with formidable enemies around them, whereas Desiderius had had considerable experience in the art of ruling. And whether he bullied or hoodwinked Stephen in the matter of the murder of Christopher and Sergius, he did not attempt, under him, that violent seizure of papal territory that he began under Hadrian. Though it may be granted that the current of events in the beginning of his reign flowed too strongly to be stemmed by the most powerful, still, in the abandonment of Christopher, if the current was strong, it can scarcely be questioned that the swimmer was weak. The treatment of his primicerius by Stephen looks very like the cowardly surrendering of Wentworth by Charles I. Hence, though from his tender nursing of Pope Paul and what his biographer tells us of his pious

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

works, it may fairly be concluded that Stephen's heart was good, it can scarcely be questioned that his will was weak. The events of his reign may serve as another illustration of the fact that for the governed the rule of the weak is sometimes worse than that of the bad. The wicked prince is not unfrequently strong enough to reserve the right of doing wrong to himself. But under the weak sovereign every one does "what is right in his own eyes."

Stephen accounted a saint.

Cardinal Tripepi calls[1] attention to the fact that various calendars, martyrologies, etc., such as the ancient calendar of the saints of Sicily, the calendars and martyrologies of Ferrarius, Menard, St. Malo, etc., number Stephen among the saints, and assign his feast to February 1st; and that the inhabitants of Syracuse endeavoured to induce the Holy See to extend the worship (the 'cult'), which was there paid to him, to the whole Church.

[1] *Mem.*, etc., p. 345.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

HADRIAN I.

A.D. 772–795.

Sources.—The greater length of this contemporary biography in the *Book of the Popes* is due to the fact that there are there set forth in minute detail the labours of the Pope on the restoration of the churches, walls, and aqueducts of the city. Apart from the narration of these architectural details, practically the only events of Hadrian's life therein contained are his relations with the Lombards. Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. ccxxxiv. f., holds that the historical portion of this biography—*i.e.*, the first part, which treats of the Lombard question—was written in 774, and that the rest was the work of different compilers who wrote at different periods; and hence that the works of Hadrian on the churches are set down in chronological order. For the other actions of his important reign, we must look to other sources—such as his letters, of which there are forty-nine in the *Code* of Charlemagne. Some letters of Alcuin and others in the *Monumenta Alcuiniana* (*Bib. Rer. Ger.*, vi., or *M. G. Epp.*, iv.) are useful. The *Monumenta Alcuiniana* (ed. Wattenbach and Duemmler, Berlin, 1873) contains the anonymous life of Alcuin written in 829, his poem *De Pont. et SS. Eborac.*, his life of S. Willibrord, and his letters, with a few of those of other men. His letters also ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iv. The *Monumenta Carolina* (ed. Jaffé, Berlin, 1867) contains, besides the *Codex Carolinus*, the letters and ancient lives of Charlemagne. In dating his letters, this Pope was the first to substitute (an. 781) his own episcopal years for those of the emperor. (*L. P.*, i., ed. Mom., p. vii. n.). And, as bearing on the same point, it may be noted, with Dr. Hodgkin (*Italy*, etc., viii. p. 55 n.), that "the latest extant document in which a Pope dates by

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the years of an Eastern emperor is xcviii. (or 90) of the *Regesto di Farfa*, and is dated on the 10th day before the kalends of March in the 33rd of Constantine V., and the 21st of his son Leo IV., equivalent to A.D. 772." And it is under Hadrian that 'formulas really *diplomatic*' begin to appear in the papal documents. The *Scriptum* and the *Datum* reveal a regularly constituted chancellary; and the formula, *In perpetuum*, which is found for the first time under this Pope, well corresponds by its solemnity to the newly-acquired importance of the Papacy, as is well observed by Rodolico (*Note Paleografiche e Diplomatiche sul Privilegio Pontificio*, pp. 9, 10). Malmesbury, Wendover, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, etc., give us information on Hadrian's work in connection with this country.

The *Chronicles* of the Franks, on which, besides the works cited above, consult *Les Sources de l'histoire de France*, by A. Molinier, Paris, 1902, i. c. 14.

On the 'Adoptionist' heresy, the works of Alcuin are the most important authorities.

For the Iconoclast controversy, we have the Acts of the Seventh General Council; and those of Frankfort, as well as the so-called Caroline books, of which more in the text.

The industrious Mabillon brought to light (*Museum Italicum*, i. pt. ii., p. 38 f., ed. Paris, 1724) a short ancient life of this Pope by an anonymous monk of the monastery of Nonantula. The life is of no great importance. The monk who wrote this brief sketch seems to have been under the impression that the Pope Hadrian, who died at Nonantula, was Pope Hadrian I., instead of Hadrian III. Under this mistake he compiled, accurately enough as far as it goes, a life of Hadrian I., to which he appended certain events that had taken place in connection with the body (really that of Hadrian III.) of the Pope that reposed in his monastery. Hence it may be concluded that the *Life* was drawn up in the tenth century. For the facts of the story which occurs at the end of it, viz., of monks breaking into Hadrian III.'s tomb to get his vestments for their use, must have taken place when the tradition of the Pope's burial was fairly fresh, and when the vestments in which the body was clothed might be supposed, by the intending violators of its tomb, to be still undecayed. And as the writer speaks of a part of the said

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

vestments as still in the monastery, we shall not perhaps be far wrong in assigning the tenth century as the date of the composition of this anonymous life.

Modern Works.—A study of the life of Hadrian will be much helped by studying the lives of Charlemagne and Alcuin. A useful work in this connection is *Alcuin et Charlemagne*, par M. François Monnier, Paris, 1864. F. Lorenz's *Life of Alcuin* has been translated into English by Slee, London, 1837. There are numerous biographies of Charlemagne. I have used those by James (London, 1832); Dr. Hodgkin (London, 1897), and Davis (London, 1900).

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	KING OF THE LOMBARDS.	KING OF THE FRANKS.
Constantine (Copronymus), 741–775.	Desiderius, 756–774.	Charlemagne, 771–800.
Leo IV., 775–780.		
Constantine VI. (Porphyrogenitus), 780–797.		
Irene, 780–790.		

The importance of the reign of Hadrian.

THE pontificate of Pope Hadrian is important, not only because it was the longest of any in the Middle Ages, but also because of the momentous events that took place during it, and in which he took a very great share. In his reign, not only was the temporal power of the popes placed on a still firmer basis by the confirmation of Pippin's deed of gift by his son Charlemagne, but the power of its greatest enemies, the Lombards, was broken for ever. On the one side, too, in the East, the heresy of the Image-breakers was dealt such a blow by the Seventh General Council that it never regained its former strength; and on the other side, in the far West, a new heresy was so promptly attacked that it disappeared not long after the death of the Pope. And that Rome, their dwelling-place, might share in the immortality decreed by our Divine Lord for the popes themselves, might be indeed 'eternal,' as early imperial coins proclaimed it to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

be, Hadrian practically rebuilt the city on the seven hills. Its churches he restored, its walls he re-erected, its aqueducts he again caused to flow. And last, but not least, he greatly contributed to the advance of European civilisation, by using the influence which he had with Charlemagne in helping that great prince (before whose time, as the old chronicler[1] ingenuously remarks, no attention was paid to the liberal arts in Gaul), both by advice and by gifts of books and masters, in his efforts to light the torch of learning in his vast dominions. And all this in despite of turbulent officials, both cleric and lay, whom it required all the power of Charlemagne to keep in check.

Early life of Hadrian, and character.

The author of all these noble deeds, "one of the greatest popes of the eighth century," writes Hodgkin, was, as is so frequently the case with the doers of great things, himself of noble birth. He was a Roman, and not unworthy of the name. His family, at once noble and powerful, belonging apparently to the new military aristocracy, had their home[2] in the fifth ecclesiastical quarter, that known as the Via Lata. Left an orphan whilst still very young, by the death of both his parents, the little Hadrian was carefully trained by an uncle, one Theodotus, who had formerly held the title of consul and duke, and was then primicerius of the notaries. There is still extant a marble tablet, in the Church of St. Angela in Pescheria, which testifies to the piety of Theodotus. It records how, for the good of his soul, and the pardon of his sins, he restored the church whilst primicerius.[3]

[1] An. Lauriss., ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 171. "Ante ipsum enim domnum regem Carolum in Gallia nullum studium fuerat liberalium artium."

[2] Speaking of S. Maria in Cosmedin, Murray, *Hand-book for Rome*, p. 213, says that under the portico there is "a very rude eighth century relief of arches, representing" the house of Pope Hadrian. I can only say that, when a few weeks ago I there looked for it, I could not find it.

[3] The recent excavations, already spoken of at length under John

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Under the care of such a tutor, we need not wonder that his biographer speaks of the hours which Hadrian spent, whilst still a young laic, in the Church of St. Mark, which was near the parental mansion. Not content with prayer, he strove to subdue his passions by fasting[1] and the use of the hair-shirt. To the utmost of his ability also he gave alms to the poor. His good deeds were the talk of Rome. The knowledge of his virtues caused Pope Paul to order him to become a cleric. Paul then named him a regionary notary, and afterwards ordained him subdeacon. By Stephen (III.) IV. he was made a deacon. The reception of the diaconate made him work harder than ever at preaching the Gospel and the other duties of his office. Being such by birth and training, we can readily believe his biographer when he assures us that Hadrian was as polished and refined in his mind as he was shapely and handsome in body; that he was a firm upholder of his country and the faith, and that he

VII., revealed the fact that he was the donor of the Church of S. Maria Antica. On one of the walls of a little chapel, where there are frescoes of the martyrdom of SS. Quiricus and Julitta, there are to be seen seven figures. In the centre, Our Lady on a throne with Our Lord, as a Child, in her arms, with SS. Peter and Paul on either side of her; on her left are SS. Julitta and Pope Zachary (741–752), with a square nimbus, showing he was then alive; and on her right St. Quiricus and Theodotus, who, turned towards Our Lady, is offering her a Church, that of S. Maria Antica. Over the head of Theodotus, in white, is the following rude inscription :—

✠ (T)heodotus Prim(icer)o Defensorum et D(ispen)-
satore Sancte Dei Ge(nitri)cis Senperque Birgo Mar(i)a
Que appellatur Antiqua.

Cf. Archivio della R. Soc. Rom., 1900, p. 524.

[1] "Indutusque cilicio, jejuniis corpus suum macerabat." *L. P.*, from which all the above is taken. From the contemptuous manner in which many moderns write of such aids as fasting, etc., to the subjection of our passions, have we to conclude that they subdue their passions without having to practise that self-denial which Our Lord declared necessary?

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was the father of the poor, and a most reverent observer of ecclesiastical traditions.

Before Pope Stephen was actually dead, the people came together to elect Hadrian, so great was their love for him,[1] and no sooner was the Pope dead than Hadrian was elected to succeed him (February 3, 772) by the unanimous vote of clergy and people.[2] The anonymous monk of Nonantula gives in full the decree of Hadrian's election, which, *mutatis mutandis*, is in the prescribed form which occurs in the *Liber Diurnus*. This document sets forth that in response to the prayer of all the clergy and people[3] together assembled, the deacon Hadrian was, on account of his exceptional merits, unanimously elected, and that the decree of election was placed in the archives of the Vatican palace. Elected Pope, 772.

It would seem not at all unlikely that this prompt action of the Roman people in finding a successor for Stephen was to anticipate any measures on the part of Paul Afiarta to procure a pontiff who might be at the beck of the Lombard. The moment he was elected, Hadrian not only gave a striking proof of his determined character, but showed Paul who was to be master in Rome. The very hour (*confestim eadem hora*) he was elected, he commanded the recall of those whom Paul had banished during the illness of Stephen. Further, in accordance

[1] "Ferventissimo affectu a populo Romano diligeretur." *L. P.*

[2] "Hic (Hadrianus) . . . . ad ordinem episcopatus communi concordia omnium clericorum ac populorum electus est." (*Anon. vit.*, ap. Mab.) According to Jaffé, his election would have to be set down to Feb. 1.

[3] "Id est cuncti sacerdotes et proceres ecclesiæ et universus clerus atque optimates, et universa militaris præsentia seu cives honesti, et cuncta generalitas populi. . . . Hoc vero decretum a nobis factum, subter manibus propriis roborantes, in archivio. . . . recondi fecimus, mense Feb." *Anon. vit.*; *cf. Lib. Diurn.*, which was one of the sources of the anonymous monk.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with what was perhaps a custom, he set free those who were in prison for one crime or another.[1] And certainly, in accordance with custom, he drew up a profession of faith, which he sent to "his most reverend brethren and to all the faithful."[2]

The deceitful action of Desiderius.

No sooner was Hadrian consecrated (February 9) than he had to receive a deputation from the Lombard king. That monarch had evidently made up his mind that it was to be now or never with him if he was to become lord of all Italy. Charlemagne, against whom he was personally enraged, because that prince had repudiated his daughter, he thought he could afford to despise. He was young, was surrounded by enemies, especially the Saxons, against whom he had to struggle for thirty-three years (772–805), and had to fear the chances of a civil war. For when Carlomann died, in December 771, his widow Gilberga, with her two sons and some of his chief nobles, had fled to the court of Desiderius, "for no reason whatever," says Eginhard.[3] And as these sons of Carlomann were but children, the great bulk of his people had offered his kingdom to Charlemagne, who had thus become sole king of the Franks.[4]

Resolving, however, to try the fox's skin before the lion's, Desiderius sent an embassy to Hadrian, hoping to induce him to place his trust in him (Desiderius), and assuring the Pope that he wished to live at peace with him. When, in reply, Hadrian urged the previous bad faith of

[1] *L. P.* *Cf.* Agnellus, who states that Pope Paul did the same thing (Agnell. in vit. Sergii).

[2] *Anon. vit.*; *cf. Lib. Diurn.*

[3] *Vit. Car.*, c. 3.

[4] *Ib.* *Cf. Annal. Eginhard.* and *Annal. Metens.* Hence the language of Gregorovius, *Rome*, etc., ii. p. 344, that Charlemagne "seized the territories belonging to his nephew," is inaccurate. *Cf.* James, *Hist. of Charlemagne*, where that point is clearly treated (p. 139 f.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

their king towards Stephen in the affair of Christopher and Sergius, the envoys took an oath that Desiderius would restore to Hadrian the 'rights' he had failed to restore to Stephen, and that he would really live in peace with the Pope.[1] Trusting to their oaths, Hadrian despatched Stephen, a regionary notary and saccellarius (paymaster), and Paul Afiarta to treat with the Lombard king. But they had not got beyond Perugia when they learnt that Desiderius, as usual without any better reason than his desire for the 'unification of Italy,' had seized Faventia, the duchy of Ferrara (both of which he had given up in 757), and Commacchio (Comiaclum), had beset Ravenna itself, and was harrying the whole province.[2] A deputation came from Archbishop Leo of Ravenna to implore help from the Pope. Hadrian thereupon ordered his envoys to proceed on their journey to Desiderius, with letters in which, as might be expected, the Pope upbraided the Lombard for his twofold breach of faith. Meanwhile Gilberga and her sons had arrived at the Lombard court, and their cause was at once espoused by the king. "And hence,"[3] says the papal biographer, in one of the rare passages in which, in set terms, he gives us any of the motives that prompted any of the acts he relates, "Desiderius used every art to try and induce the Pope to come and visit him, in order that he (the Pope) might anoint as kings the two sons of Carlomann. For the Lombard was very desirous of bringing about a division in the kingdom of the Franks, a coolness in the friendship between the Pope and Charlemagne, and the subjection of Rome

[1] *L. P.*

[2] Direct from the *L. P.*

[3] "Et ob hoc ipsum sanct. præsulem ad se properandum seducere conabatur, ut ipsos Carolomanni filios reges ungeret cupiens divisionem in regno Francorum immittere, etc. . . . . cunctamque Italiam sui regni . . . . potestati subjugare." *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and all Italy to his own sway." Although Desiderius promised the Pope that he would restore the cities if he would come to him, Hadrian firmly refused to go. When the Pope's determination became known, Paul Afiarta assured Desiderius that he would see to it that Hadrian complied with the king's wishes, for, if necessary, he would put a rope round the Pope's legs and drag him to the Lombard court by the heels.[1] He set off by Arimini to fulfil his engagement. But there was already a rope round the boaster's own neck.

The punishment of Afiarta, 772.

When Paul left Rome, men had the courage to let the Pope know that the unfortunate secundicerius Sergius had been dragged forth from his cell in the Lateran and strangled and stabbed in the 'via Merulana'—a street as well known now as in the eighth century—by order of Afiarta. Hadrian made the most careful enquiries[2] into the matter, had the accomplices of Paul arrested, and, in response to the wishes of all the people, handed them over to the 'prefect of the city' to be tried for murder. Death, or exile to Constantinople, was meted out to the culprits.

In accordance with secret instructions conveyed to him from the Pope, Leo, the archbishop of Ravenna, caused Paul to be seized as he passed through Arimini. And when he received from Rome the account of the trial of Paul's agents, the archbishop went beyond the Pope's orders. He not only handed Paul over to the secular arm, to the consular of Ravenna (*consulari Ravennatium urbis*), but, despite the strict orders of the Pope to the contrary,

[1] *L. P.*

[2] Details in the *L. P.* Hadrian caused the bodies of Christopher and Sergius to be honourably buried in St. Peter's. The whole action of this Pope with regard to those two men shows that he did not regard them as false to his predecessor.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and despite every effort[1] the Pope could make to save him, as he only desired exile for the accused, the archbishop had the wretched man put to death. Some days after, however, troubled in mind at his disobedience, Leo wrote to the Pope and begged him to excuse the act, as, after all, the blood of the innocent had been avenged in the death of Paul. But this Hadrian would by no means do; he told the archbishop that he must bear the blame of Paul's death, for he himself (Hadrian) had, on the contrary, wished to spare the man's life that he might have had an opportunity to do penance.[2]

Desiderius seizes upon more cities of the exarchate. 772.

Whilst the affair of Paul was in progress, Desiderius was not idle. He marched southward with a large army, laying waste with fire and sword[3] the whole country, from Sinigagila on the Adriatic to Blera on the borders of Tuscany. The inhabitants of the last-mentioned town, supposing that there was peace,[4] were massacred by the Lombards whilst gathering in their harvest, and their town was reduced to ashes. And then, "after the manner[5] of his ancestors," he proceeded to harry the duchy of Rome. Can anyone be astonished that the popes resisted such barbarians by every means in their power?

Before appealing to the Franks, Hadrian tried every expedient. Letter after letter,[6] embassy after embassy,

[1] Again full details in the *L. P.*

[2] "Ita illi dirigens in responsis, quod ipse (Leo) videat, quid in Paulo operatus est." *L. P.*

[3] *Ib.* "Plura homicidia, et depredationes atque incendia in ipsis finibus perpetrantes."

[4] "Blerani in fiducia pacis, ad recolligendas segetes . . . . cum mulieribus egrederentur, irruerunt repente super eos ipsi Longobardi," etc. *Ib.*

[5] "Desiderius . . . . et Romanæ ecclesiæ castra et prædia more antecessorum vastabat." *Anon. vit.*; *cf. L. P.*

[6] "Sæpius atque sæpius b. præsul tam per obsecrationis litteras, quamque per missos eidem Desiderio direxit," etc. *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was sent from Rome to the Lombard to induce him to pause in his career of violence, and restore his ill-gotten goods. If Desiderius made any reply, it was only to the effect that the Pope must come and see him. To which request Hadrian always replied that he would certainly do so when Desiderius had restored the cities.

Desiderius marches on Rome, 773.

Negotiation was clearly useless. The Lombard was on the march for Rome itself with his son Adalgis and the widow and two sons of Carlomann. But Hadrian was equal to the occasion. He not only, compelled by necessity,[1] sent messengers by sea to Charlemagne to implore his aid, but he collected troops from all parts, even from the Pentapolis, and hurriedly strengthened the fortifications of the city. He then sent three cardinal-bishops to Desiderius to forbid him, under pain of excommunication, entering the Roman duchy. Whether he had faith enough to fear a papal sentence of excommunication, or policy enough to dread the power of the Franks, certain it is that he fell back in confusion from Viterbo.[2]

Ambassadors of Charlemagne arrive in Rome.

Desiderius had not long withdrawn from the papal boundaries ere there arrived in Rome ambassadors from Charlemagne (among whom seems to have been our countryman Alcuin—*Albuinus, deliciosus regis*), who came to see for themselves whether Desiderius had really made restitution to the Pope, as he had assured the Franks that he had done. Of course they found that anything but restitution had been effected by the false Lombard. Nor could

[1] "Necessitate compulsus." *L. P.*; *cf. Annales Tilliani*, etc., ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.

[2] "Susceptoque eodem obligationis (anathematis) verbo . . . . Rex illico cum magna reverentia a civitate Viterbiense confusus ad propria reversus est." *L. P.*, n. 25.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

they, though they interviewed Desiderius on their return journey, obtain any concessions from him. In company with ambassadors from the Pope, they returned to their king and told him the state of the case. Urged by the papal envoys to act in behalf of their master, Charlemagne at first tried pacific measures. His envoys were commissioned to offer Desiderius no less than 14,000[1] gold solidi, if he would give up the territory he had seized. But Desiderius was fanatically obstinate.

Expedition of Charlemagne into Italy, 773.

Charlemagne now prepared for war. His troops appeared at the passes of the Alps. Whether favoured by treachery or not, he successfully accomplished the difficult task of conveying his forces over the Alps.[2] Charlemagne's secretary and biographer, Eginhard, assures us that had he not been anxious to describe his master's character, rather than his wars, he would have told us "how great was the toil of the Franks in overcoming the trackless chain of mountains, with peaks towering to the skies, and sharp and perilous rocks." Desiderius fled to Pavia, and there prepared to stand a siege in that strong city. Adalgis, with the widow and sons of Carlomann, shut themselves up in Verona.

The duchy of Spoleto places itself under the rule of the Pope, 773.

One of the immediate results of the appearance of Charlemagne in Italy was the defection of part of the subjects of Desiderius, viz., the inhabitants of the duchy of Spoleto. Already, before the descent of the Frankish king into Italy, some of the chief men of the Lombard cities of Rieti and Spoleto placed themselves under the Pope, took an oath

[1] All this direct from the *L. P.* The papal envoy asked Charlemagne's help "quod ipse legitimus tutor et defensor esset illius (Romanæ) plebis, quoniam illum prædecessor suus b. m. Stephanus P. unctione sacra liniens in Regem ac Patricium Romanorum ordinarat." (*Chron. Moissiac.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xii. 28.)

[2] *Cf.* Eginhard, *in vit. Car.*, c. 6, *L. P.* and the various annals. (James' *Life of Charlemagne*, p. 170 *seq.*).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of fidelity to him, and cut their long hair in the Roman fashion.[1] We have already seen evidences of a desire on the part of the duchy of Spoleto to attach its fortunes to those of Rome and the popes; and on the present occasion the entire people, but for dread of their sovereign, would have been glad to follow the example set them by their principal men. When, however, their countrymen came flying from the North and told them of the forcing of the passes of the Alps, the fear of Desiderius, which had up to this restrained them, disappeared, and they flocked to the Pope and besought him to accept them as his subjects.[2] Hadrian could not but receive them. And in St. Peter's all swore[3] to be the faithful subjects of the apostle, of his vicar, Pope Hadrian, and all his successors. After the hair of all had been cut in the Roman style, Hadrian confirmed one Hildeprand, whom they had themselves chosen, as their duke. Certain cities of the exarchate (Fermo, Osimo and Ancona), which had either never been yielded up to the popes, or had again been seized by the Lombards, followed the example of Spoleto.[4] Here, beyond all doubt, we have an example

[1] "Spoletini et Reatini, aliquanti eorum utiles personæ .... Hadriano se tradiderunt et in fide .... pontificis jurantes more Romanorum tonsurati sunt." *L. P.*

[2] "Confestim generaliter ad Pont. confluentes advenerunt, (et) .... deprecati sunt ut eos in servitio b. Petri susciperet." *Ib.*, n. 32.

[3] "Omnes unanimiter .... jurejurando promiserunt eidem Dei Apostolo in servitio ejus, atque Vicarii ipsius Hadriani atque omnibus successoribus ejus fideliter permansuros." *Ib.* And hence Hildeprand dated his documents "in the times of the thrice blessed and coangelic lord Hadrian, pontiff and universal Pope." *Cf. Regist. Farfense*, c. (or xci.), cited by Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 516. Later on, after 776, as though he preferred a master at a distance to one close at hand, we find him dating charters by the regnal years of Charlemagne, king of the Franks and Lombards.

[4] *L. P.* Mention is there also made of similar action on the part of a 'castellum Felicitatis' (or Fulginatis), which is perhaps Foligno (Fulginium), a city of the duchy of Spoleto, on the Flaminian Way. It

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of one way in which temporal power was absolutely thrust into the hands of the popes by the people themselves.

The blockade of Pavia, 773.

Arrived before Pavia in the autumn (773), Charlemagne resolved to reduce it by starvation, and took measures accordingly by surrounding the city with lines of circumvallation. And that his purpose of staying there till the place was unconditionally surrendered might be clear, he sent for his wife and children. Whilst the blockade was still being maintained, detachments of the Franks were sent in all directions to bring about the reduction of the other cities. Verona surrendered on the mere approach of Charlemagne. After the siege of Pavia had lasted some six months, Charlemagne resolved to gratify his great desire of visiting the tombs of the Apostles, the more so as the festival of Easter was at hand.[1] Taking with him a considerable number of his chief ecclesiastics and nobles (*episcopi*, *duces*, *graphiones*), and a large body of troops, he set out with his accustomed speed so as to be in Rome by Holy Saturday (April 2). Astonished and yet delighted at the news of this sudden resolve of the Frankish monarch, Hadrian made haste to receive him with becoming honour.

Charlemagne goes to Rome, 774.

Some twenty-four miles from Rome, at a place known as 'ad Novas,' the ruins of which are to be seen near Lake Bracciano, Charlemagne was met by the 'judges' with the military standards (*bandora*). Nearer the city he was received by the 'trained bands' and all the school-children bearing palm and olive branches in their hands,

is more probably the same as the modern Città di Castello, which stands on the site of the ancient Tifernum Tiberinum, and belonged to Lombard Tuscany and to the duchy of Chiusi.

[1] This passage fixes the date of the commencement of the blockade. "Magnum desiderium habens ad limina apostolorum properandi, considerans quod et sacratissima Paschalis festivitas appropinquasset." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and chanting the praises of the Frankish king. There were also sent forth in his honour "the venerable crosses and the sacred banners," as was wont to be done when, under the old *régime*, the exarch came to Rome. We are told that when Charlemagne saw the sacred crosses,[1] he descended from his horse, and with his nobles proceeded on foot to St. Peter's. Arrived there, the king mounted the steps, devoutly kissing each one of them as he ascended. After embracing one another, Hadrian and Charlemagne entered the basilica together, which rang with the antiphon: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." When all present had returned thanks to God at the confession of St. Peter for the victories He had granted to the arms of the Franks, through the intercession of His apostle, Charlemagne assured Hadrian (ep. 56 *G.*) that he and his Franks had undertaken this expedition not for gold or territory, but to secure 'the rights of St. Peter,' the Pope's safety, and the exaltation of God's Holy Church. He then begged[2] the Pope's permission to enter Rome that he might pray in the different churches. The fact that before Charlemagne entered the city oaths of mutual good faith were given and taken by Charlemagne and the Pope "is not less demonstrative of the fact that the

[1] All direct from the *L. P.* "Qua hora easdem sacratissimas cruces ac signa . . . . conspexit, descendens de equo," etc. This is a proof, by the way, that Charlemagne practised the worship of images. *Cf.* Hadrian's own account of the reception of the Frankish king in the metrical acrostic, which he prefixed to his collection of the canons of Dionysius, which he presented to Charlemagne on this occasion, ap. Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 516.

[2] "*Obnixe deprecatus est* isdem Rex . . . . Pontificem, illi licentiam tribui Romam ingrediendi ad sua orationum vota . . . . persolvenda. . . . Tam ipse Papa quam . . . . Rex . . . . seseque mutuo per sacramentum munientes, ingressus est Romam . . . . ipse Rex cum suis judicibus." *L. P.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Pope held the supreme power in Rome, and that his sovereignty over the city was entirely independent of the Frank kings, than it is of the perpetual apprehension of violence and stratagem, which, in those ages of barbarism and constantly-recurring invasion, kept men's minds on the alert, as in time of war."[1]

That same Saturday, and until the following Wednesday, the minds and the time of the Pope and Charlemagne were taken up with the different religious services in the great basilicas. But on the last-mentioned day, Hadrian, with his chief clergy and nobility, had a conference with Charlemagne on secular affairs in St. Peter's. As what follows is of the first importance in connection with the temporal power of the Pope, we will closely adhere to the narrative in the *Book of the Popes*. Hadrian, we are there told, begged Charlemagne to fulfil in every particular the details of the donation (*promissio*) which his father Pippin, as well as he himself and his brother Carlomann, had made to Blessed Peter and to his vicar Pope Stephen (II.) III., on the occasion of that Pope's visit to the land of the Franks. This donation, continues the papal biographer, involved "the concession[2] of various cities and territories *in this province of Italy* to Blessed Peter and to his successors, to be possessed by them for ever." When the said donation, which had been drawn up at Kiersey (or Quiercy-sur-Oise) had been read, Charlemagne ordered his chaplain and notary, Etherius, to draw up another donation, *like the former*. In it he granted the *same cities* and *territories* to Blessed

[1] Miley's *Hist. of the Papal States*, i. p. 277.

[2] Rogavit ut promissionem "pro concedendis diversis civitatibus, ac territoriis *istius provinciæ Italiæ* et contradendis b. Petro ejusque omnibus Vicariis in perpetuum possidendis, adimpleret in omnibus." *L. P.*, n. 41.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Peter and the Pope, according to the description set forth in the donation.[1]

The donation of Charlemagne.

Before proceeding further with the narrative in the *Liber Pontificalis*, it is worth pausing to note that Hadrian's biographer, who was perfectly familiar with the actual deed of donation, makes the gift of Charlemagne no more than a confirmation of the original donation of Pippin to Stephen III. at Kiersey.[2] Strictly speaking, therefore, Charlemagne did not augment his father's gift. But his donation was doubtless an increase of *Aistulf's*, with which the popes had hitherto been contented. There seems never to have been an attempt to enforce the 'Kiersey treaty.' To judge of this document by the 'donation of Charlemagne,' which is represented as nothing more than its renewal, it would seem that Pippin and his Franks had determined, if need be, to limit the Lombards to the territory first conquered and directly held by Alboin, their first king who ruled in Italy. The other parts of Italy, which the Lombards acquired later, or which were only imperfectly subject to the rule of their kings, such as the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, were to have been

[1] "Aliam donationis promissionem ad instar anterioris . . . . rex ascribi jussit per Etherium ; . . . . ubi concessit *easdem civitates* et territoria b. Petro, easque Pontifici contradi spopondit per designationem confinium, sicut in eadem donatione continere monstratur: *i.e.*, a Lunis cum insula Corsica, deinde in Suriano, deinde in monte Bardone, inde in Verceto, deinde in Parma, deinde in Rhegio, et exinde in Mantua atque monte Silicis, simulque et universum Exarchatum Ravennatium, sicut antiquitus erat, atque provincias Venetiarum et Histriam necnon et cunctum Ducatum Spoletinum, et Beneventanum" (*ib.*). Eginhard (*in vit. Car.*, c. 6) simply says that Charlemagne "restored to the Romans all that had been forcibly taken from them. . . . And all that had been seized by the Lombard kings was restored to Hadrian, the rector of the Roman Church." *Annal. Petav.* (ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.) say that after the fall of Pavia, Charlemagne "lætus S. Petro reddidit civitates quas debuit."

[2] *Cf. sup.*, pp. 301, 312.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

handed over, by the terms of the Kiersey compact, to the Pope. This clipping of the Lombards' wings, by forming a powerful state under the Pope all round them, had not up to this time been put into effect. Aistulf's donation of the exarchate had been temporarily accepted. Now that the Lombard kingdom was to be extinguished, it was only natural that there should be a reversion to the original deed of gift.

Charlemagne's diploma, signed by him and his chief men, both of Church and State, was placed in the confession of St. Peter. A copy of the same deed, which they had all sworn to observe, was taken away with them by the Franks.[1]

Extent of the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne.

By this donation of Charlemagne there were made over to the popes, besides the full exarchate of Ravenna, the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, the provinces of Venetia and Istria, the island of Corsica, and, arguing from the towns mentioned, viz., Luna (Sarzana), Parma, Reggio, etc., what, in addition to the exarchate, would make the larger portion of modern Emilia. By the province of Venetia would be meant that part on the mainland which was subject to the Lombard sway.[2] Later writers, such as Leo Ostiensis (eleventh century); Cardinal Deusdedit, in his collection of canons (eleventh century); and Cencius Camerarius[3] (*Lib. censuum*), thirteenth century, all, from

[1] *L. P.*

[2] *Cf.* Jungmann, *Dis.*, xiv. § 75. Of this valuable dissertation we have made no little use. The towns mentioned in the *L. P.* are Luna (Sarzana, near Spezia), Suriano (?); Monte Bardone, Bardi (?); Berceto (some twenty-eight miles from Parma); Parma, Rheggio, Mantua, and Monselice (a few miles from Padua). The northern boundary of the papal territory was evidently a line from Luna to Monselice on the frontier of the duchy of Venice. *Cf.* Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. ccxxxvi. f. If the Pope had ever come into actual possession of all the provinces set down in this donation, he would have been lord of nearly two-thirds of Italy.

[3] Ap. Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i. 2.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

earlier documents, *e.g.*, the *Book of the Popes*, describe the donation in more or less the same terms.

The authenticity of the donation is called in question.

The originals of these charters have unfortunately been lost. And there are not wanting modern historians who call in question, if not the fact that Charlemagne gave a donation at all, at least that it had the extent that the papal biographer gives it. These critics urge that it is not *likely* that the Frank monarch would give such extensive territory to the Holy See; and that, *de facto*, dominion over many of the districts mentioned in the donation was never held by the popes, nay, was not even in the hands of Charlemagne, much less of Pippin, when the donations were made.

The donation is genuine.

That there are difficulties in the matter of these deeds should not surprise us, when only abridgments of them have come down to us. But the criterion for the authenticity of ancient documents is not what certain modern critics may or may not '*think likely*.' Documents cannot be rejected because there are obscurities connected with them, or because their contents seem 'unlikely' to this or that historian, but only on very solid grounds. And certainly, with regard to the passage in the life of Hadrian regarding the donation of Charlemagne, there is no more real reason to doubt its authenticity than there is to doubt of the passage in the life of Stephen (II.) III. concerning that of Charlemagne's father Pippin. And if to disprove the authenticity of the grant of Pippin it would be necessary to disprove the authenticity of a great many other accepted documents, notably of many of the letters of Pope Paul in the Caroline Code, so also to disprove the grant of Charlemagne it would be needful to show the unauthenticity of many of the letters of Hadrian (or Leo III.) in the same Code which seem to support the text in the *Liber Pontificalis*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The territory—nearly two-thirds of Italy—which, according to the text in the *Book of the Popes*, was made over to the popes by the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne, stretched as far to the south as did the boundaries of the duchy of Beneventum, and in the north to a line drawn from Sarzana (Luna, close to the Gulf of Spezzia) northwards along the river Magra, across the Apennines at the Cisa Pass, touching Berceto, Parma, Reggio, Mantua, and Monselice, and then turning so as to embrace Venetia and Istria. To this tract of country must be added the isle of Corsica.

Now, in the first place it is not denied that the popes never actually held possession of all the country included within the limits just named. But we shall proceed to show that after the donation of Charlemagne, the extant acknowledged authentic documents prove that the sovereign pontiffs passed into actual possession, or at least proved their right to so much of the territory marked out in the *donation*, as given in the *Liber Pontificalis*, as to make it only reasonable to suppose that that donation really represents the gift of Charlemagne. The evidence which will be adduced to establish this point will also go to furnish us with a reason why the *donation* was never actually carried out. The evidence will show us that the Frankish ruler was not powerful enough to bring much of the territory mentioned in the famous passage under his absolute sway.

One extract from a letter of Hadrian to Charlemagne will suffice to make it plain that that king did make a donation to *St. Peter*, and that it was similar to that made by his father. "Deign," writes[1] the Pope, "to accomplish what your father and you yourself promised to Blessed

[1] *Cod. C.*, 55 *G.* "Cuncta . . . . adimplere dignemini quæ . . . . tu ipse . . . . ea ipsa spondens confirmasti, eidemque apostolo præsentialiter manibus tuis eamdem obtulisti promissionem."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Peter, and what afterwards, on the occasion of your visit to the shrine of the Apostles, you yourself confirmed, making the *same donation* to the same Apostle in your own person and with your own hands."

And to establish the fact that the donation involved a grant of territory, and of regal jurisdiction over it, and not merely of *patrimonies*, *i.e.*, revenues or estates, it will be enough to note that Hadrian often distinguishes in his letters to Charlemagne between the latter's gifts of *patrimonies* on the one hand and on the other of territory over which he (the Pope) was to exercise sovereign powers. And so on one occasion[1] Hadrian had to complain to Charlemagne that, in connection with certain cities in the Beneventan territory—*de civitatibus partibus Beneventanis*—the king's missi would only hand over to him "the bishops' houses, monasteries and the public buildings (*curtes publicas*), along with the keys of the cities, but not the men. They are left free to come and go as they list. And how can we hold the cities without the men, if their inhabitants can plot against them? We desire, therefore, to have full power over them and to rule and govern them as we do in the case of the cities in Tuscany which you have given us." The difficulty of giving the exact sense of this

[1] *Cod. C.*, 84 *G.*, 87 *J.* *Cf.* the close of 79 and 80 *G.*, *J.* 83 and 84. In the metrical acrostic which forms the dedication of the Dionysian collection of canons which Hadrian sent to Charlemagne, the Pope writes among other things, distinguishing between cities or territories, and *rights* or patrimonies :—

> Reddidit (Carolus M.) prisca dona ecclesiæ matri suæ,
> Urbesque magnas, fines simul et castra diversa . . . .
> Exutus suffragiis almis spondebat lingua magistro
> Genium servare sanctæ ecclesiæ in ævo Romanæ,
> Justitias almi Petri sui protectoris tueri
> Habilem (?) ut super donans in ejus confessione libavit.

(Cited in full from Maassen (*Quellen*, i. 965) by Duchesne, i. 516.) The acrostic gives: Domino eccell. filio Carulo magno regi Hadrianus papa.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

passage, though its general drift is clear enough, makes one heartily wish that either Hadrian, his secretaries, or their copyists had written clearer and better Latin.

There is further, we hold, solid reason to believe not merely that Charlemagne made to Hadrian a donation, but that the text under discussion in the *Liber Pontificalis* gives us the substance of that donation. To begin with, one might be tempted to think that it was not likely that the island of Corsica should be given to the popes. And yet a letter of Pope Leo III. shows that the popes did actually possess Corsica, and that, too, by virtue of Charlemagne's donation. For that his 'donation might remain intact,' Leo III. 'entrusts the affairs of Corsica'[1] to the king.

Then, too, no matter how unlikely it may seem that the duchy of Spoleto should be granted to the bishops of Rome, there can be no doubt that it was included in the grant. For Hadrian could confidently write to his royal friend: "Moreover,[2] you yourself in your own person, through our Insignificance, offered to Blessed Peter, your protector, the duchy of Spoleto for the welfare of your soul." Nor need we remind the reader that the Spoletans had already placed themselves under the Pope, and that, in testimony thereof, their duke, Hildeprand, who had sworn

[1] Ep. 1, ed. Hampe, *J.* 1. "De insula Corsica, unde et in scriptis et per missos vestros nobis emisistis, in vestrum arbitrium et dispositum committimus. Atque in ore posuimus Helmengandi comitis: ut vestra donatio semper firma et stabilis permaneat." *Cf.* one of the lives of Sergius II. (844–847), c. 44, ap. Duchesne, *L. P.*, ii. 99, where a certain Count Adelvert is spoken of as governor of Corsica for the Pope.

[2] 56 *G.*, *J.* 57. "Quia et ipsum Spoletinum ducatum vos præsentaliter offeruistis protectori vestro b. Petro princ. app. per nostram mediocritatem pro animæ vestræ mercæde (*sic*)." *Cf.* the spontaneous surrender of themselves by the people of Spoleto to the Franks under Stephen (II.) III., and to Pope Hadrian, just related.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

allegiance to the Pope, dated his documents[1] "in the times of the thrice blessed and angelic lord, Hadrian, pontiff and universal Pope."

But what of Lombard Tuscany, *i.e.*, the country between Luna and the boundary of the duchy of Rome? Well, again the letters of Hadrian to Charlemagne show that at least half of it was sooner or later in the hands of that pontiff. For not only does he mention as his the southern towns of Suana, Tuscana (Tuscanella), Viterbo and Balneoregis (Bagnorea), etc., but others as far as Rosellae, Populonium and Castrum Felicitatis[2]; unless, indeed, in the case of Populonium and Rosellae there was not merely question of *patrimonies*.

However, whether or not Hadrian ever possessed the whole of Lombard Tuscany, it is certain, at any rate, that he never held the whole of the duchy of Beneventum! But that does not make it certain that it was never given to him. On the contrary, we know, on the one hand, that he actually did become the lord of a part of it[3]; and, on the other hand, a fragment[4] of a report of Charlemagne's *missi* (envoys), which has come down to us, shows that the authority of the Frankish monarch was not strong enough there to enable him to put Hadrian in possession of the duchy. Besides, it is the less wonderful that Beneventum should have been included in the donation,

[1] *Regist. Farf.*, c. (91), ap. Hodgkin, *Italy*, viii. 29.

[2] *Cf.* epp. 79–80, and 58 *G*. "Partibus Tusciæ civitates, *i.e.*, Suana, Tuscana, Bitervo et Balneoregis ceterasque civitates cum finibus et territoriis eorum, b. Petro offerentes condonastis." Ep. 80.

[3] Epp. 79–82, and 84 *G*.

[4] With the letter of his envoy Maginarius to Charlemagne (ap. Jaffé, *Mon. Car.*, p. 246), compare that of Hadrian to the envoy, *ib.*, 345. Annalists assure us that Beneventum was given to the Pope. *Cf. Ann. Juv. Min.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. p. 88; and the *Ann. Maximiniani*, *ib.*, xiii. ad an. 787, "Carolus Romam venit et Beneventum S. Petro reddidit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

when it is remembered that the Beneventans had *commended* themselves to Pippin *through* Pope Stephen[1] (II.) III.

Finally, there is a passage in a letter of Stephen (III.) IV. (768–772) to John of Grado, which would seem to allude to the donation of Pippin (and hence to that of Charlemagne, which does but confirm that of his father), and to the conferring of power on the Pope over even Istria and Venetia. "In the general treaty (*pactum generale*) which was drawn up between the Romans, Franks and Lombards," writes the Pope, "your province of Istria and that of Venetia were included. Hence let your holiness trust in God, that as the *men (fideles)* of Blessed Peter engaged on oath to be true to the interests of the Prince of the Apostles and to his vicars, who will sit in this See to the end of time, they also engaged in writing ever to defend your province from the oppression of enemies, just as this our province of the Romans and the exarchate of Ravenna."[2] The import of the passage is certainly not too clear, nor do I know whether it refers to the marriage treaty of 770 arranged between Charlemagne and Desiderius by Bertrada, or to some

[1] *Cod. C.*, 11 *G.* "Et tam ipsi Spolitini quamque etiam Beneventani omnes se commendare *per nos* . . . . excellentiæ tuæ cupiunt."

[2] Ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. p. 715. "In nostro pacto generali, quod inter Romanos, Francos et Longobardos dignosciter provenisse, et ipsa vestra Istriarum provincia constat esse confirmata atque annexa simulque et Venetiarum provincia. Ideo confidat in Deo sanctitas tua quia ita fideles b. Petri studuerunt ad serviendum jurejurando b. Petro App. Principi et ejus omnibus vicariis . . . . in scriptis contulerunt promissionem, ut sicut hanc nostram Rom. provinciam et exarchatum Ravennatium et ipsam quoque vestram provinciam pari modo ab inimicorum oppressionibus semper defendere procurent." And yet, doubtless by their hold of the cities on the coast, the Byzantines had considerable influence in Istria. *Cf. Cod. C.*, ep. 63 *G.*—written between 776–780—concerning the collection of 'pensiones B. Petri' in Istria.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

other. But as Stephen IV. quotes the example of his predecessor Stephen (II.) III.'s interest in Istria, it would appear that rights over it conceded to Stephen III. were asserted by Stephen IV.

In a period when the records of history are as scant as they are at the close of the eighth century, it would be difficult to find an historical text better supported by supplementary documents than is the *donation passage* in the biography of Hadrian I.

With evidence, then, such as this before us, we cannot doubt that Charlemagne, by a fresh donation, confirmed that of his father, and that both donations included other territories besides that of the exarchate, viz., those mentioned in the disputed text. On the other hand, it is also certain, as has been said, that those additional territories did not all come under the power of the popes immediately after they had been granted to them. And, in fact, *dominion* over some of them, such as Istria, etc., was never acquired by the popes at all. This is to be accounted for to some extent by the fact that both Pippin and Charlemagne promised to give that of which they were not actually possessed. And when Charlemagne afterwards obtained more or less complete control over the whole of the districts enumerated in his donation, one cause and another—perhaps a certain unwillingness to part with what he had won only with considerable cost; but certainly, still more, because his hold on some of the conquered provinces was not too firm—stood in the way of his fully carrying his donation to completion. And though it is no part of the duty of the defenders of the authenticity of the donation text to be able to state why a promise made was not kept, it may be suggested, with Duchesne, that Charlemagne's promise of 774 was, with the consent

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Pope, restricted as useless and incapable of fulfilment on the occasion of the king's visit to Rome in 781. And if the popes never had full jurisdiction over all the lands named in the donation,[1] they certainly received fresh rights over them and additional revenues from them. And by the end of the year 787, Pope Hadrian was the actual ruler not only of the duchy of Rome and the exarchate, but also of various cities in Lombard Tuscany, as Suana (Sovana), Tuscana (Toscanella), Viterbo, etc., and in the duchy of Beneventum, as Sora, Arpinum, Aquino, Capua, etc.[2]

Fantuzzi's 'Fragment.'

Hitherto in connection with our account of the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne no mention has been made of the famous so-called 'Fantuzzian Fragment.' In the year 1500 the Venetian Government made a collection[3] of some 270 of the more important documents which concerned their relations with various popes and princes. The original collection is now lost. Two faulty copies of it, however, still exist. From one of these Fantuzzi[4] published the 'fragment' which bears his name. The document purports to give a detailed account of the transactions between Pippin and Stephen (II.) III.,

[1] On the abstract justice of Charlemagne's donation, *cf.* Alzog, *Church Hist.*, ii. 107 n.

[2] Consult map 63 and the letterpress thereto, by Professor Bury, in the *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, Oxford, 1897 f. There Professor Bury gives the following dates to the additions to the donation of Aistulf: 757, Desiderius surrenders to the Pope Faenza, Imola, Ferrara, Cabellum, Tiberiacum (Bagnacavallo). After 759, the territory of Bologna in the N.; Ancona, Osimo, Umana in the S.; and Castrum Felicitatis; *c.* 781, under Charlemagne, the Sabinian territory; *c.* 787, Populonium and Rosellæ (Grosseto), Suana and other Tuscan towns, and Capua, Sora, etc., were acquired.

[3] The collection was entitled "*Series litterarum, privil. et pactorum Pontif., Imperat., et aliorum Princip. ad Venetorum ducatum et eccles. spect. ab an.* 700 *c. usque ad* 1400."

[4] *Monumenti Ravennati.* The *fragment* is in vol. vi. p. 264 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

at Quiercy. It begins by asserting that, bitterly oppressed by the Lombards, Stephen asked and obtained leave of the Greek emperor to apply to the Franks for aid. It then states that, with the consent of all his chief men, Pippin undertook, if God should grant him to become conqueror of the Lombards, to bestow for the good of his soul on Blessed Peter, the 'keybearer of the heavenly kingdom,' and on the Pope, his vicar, Corsica[1] and the other territories, already mentioned from the *Book of the Popes*. To which, in this fragment, Naples seems to be added.[2]

The writer of this document, from his mention of the emperor Leo IV., would seem to have lived at the close of the eighth century.

This document has had its authenticity as stoutly attacked as defended. Without going into the pros and cons of the matter, we may sum up the pros with Jungmann.[3] "The style of the fragment, with its barbarous Latinity, points to its origin in Lombard times. The accuracy of various minute details given in the document, and the way in which it squares with the lives of Stephen III. and Hadrian, as we know them in the *Liber Pontificalis*, are enough to show the fragment is really authentic." Were it so, it would, of course, afford a strong confirmation of what we have already said with regard to the extent of Charlemagne's donation.

But no great weight can be attached to a document concerning which there are *cons* not a few, and which

[1] "Tibi, tuisque Vicariis sub omni integritate æternaliter concedimus, nullam nobis nostrisque successoribus infra ipsas terminationes potestatem reservatam Corsicam," etc. (*Frag. Fant.*)

[2] "Et si idem Dominus Deus nobis Beneventum et Neapolim subdere dignatus fuerit, integriter tibi, b. Petre, omnia prælata loca concedimus, *i.e.*, Emiliam," etc. (*ib.*). In the reënumeration of the places neither Beneventum nor Naples is mentioned.

[3] *Diss.*, xiv. § 80.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

is regarded as spurious by many distinguished scholars. In the first place, the *Fragment*, which is drawn up as though it proceeded from Pippin, is addressed to Pope Gregory! "Pippinus . . . . Gregorio apostolica sublimitate fulgenti." But both before and after that expression there is always question of Pope *Stephen*,[1] so that the introduction of 'Gregory' cannot be said to tell seriously against the authenticity of the document. Then Stephen is represented as asking, not Constantine Copronymus, who was the emperor during his reign, but Leo (IV.) to allow him to turn to the Franks for aid against the Lombards. Here again there is an answer. It is pointed out that, as early as the year 751, Leo was associated with his father in the Empire. And if, as is supposed by various authors, the *fragment* was composed during the sole reign of Leo IV. (775–780), there is obvious reason why his was the name selected for mention. The greatest difficulty in the way of allowing the genuineness of the document seems to be that the emperor of Constantinople is represented as authorising the appeal of the Pope to the Franks for their support and patronage against the Lombards. But even this seems far from an insuperable objection. To play off one foe against another was a very common policy of the rulers of Constantinople, especially from the days of Justinian; and, it may well have been thought at this time in the capital of the Empire, that, if the Franks broke the power of the Lombards and gave most of their territory to the popes, the latter would prove a foe which could be much more easily overcome by the imperial troops than the fierce

[1] Hence the document is entitled, "Pactum sive promissio facta per Pipinum patricium Stephano secundo pontifici"; and its narrative always speaks of Pope Stephen. 'Gregory' may well, therefore, be supposed to be an error of transcription.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lombard. Hence their ready consent to the Pope's request. As nothing depends upon the authenticity of this document of Fantuzzi, we may be pardoned for referring the reader elsewhere for further information with regard to it.[1]

Charlemagne's donation.

It would be neither possible nor desirable to discuss here all the different theories that have, on more or less strong grounds, been broached in connection with this donation. But in concluding our remarks on this subject, it may be useful to call attention to the truth that the dominion of a sovereign prince over a country does not necessarily imply his personal ownership of it, nor, *vice versa*, does ownership of a district imply supreme rule over it, but that in practice the overlord will probably possess more or less of the land of which he is the suzerain. And so it would not result, as a matter of course, that the popes were the supreme rulers of the districts where the 'patrimonies' of the Roman Church were situated; nor, on the other hand, because we find patrimonies in certain regions being given to them, would it follow that they were or were not already supreme rulers of those regions. The patrimonies were, so to speak, the State property, the 'crown lands' of the Roman Church and the popes. They were the private property of the Roman See, and were situated both where the said See had supreme dominion and where it had not. Charlemagne then, it would seem,

[1] Hodgkin, *Italy*, vii. 224 f.; Jungmann, *Diss. in Hist. E.*, *D.* 14. It should be stated that the *fragment* adds that over the territories granted 'no power was reserved' for Pippin and his successors, but that they were to have a share in the Pope's prayers, and be called by him and his people 'Patricians of the Romans.' The donation of Beneventum and Naples was expressly stated to be conditional on their conquest by Pippin. But Emilia, Pentapolis, both the Tuscanies, the duchies of Perugia and Spoleto, the island of Corsica, the duchy of the Venetias and Istria, and the exarchate were conceded in their entirety.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to all practical purposes *increased* both the private property of the Church, *i.e.*, its patrimonies at least, by restoring in various districts its 'rights' (*justitiæ*), which the Lombards had usurped, and its dominion,[1] by rendering real a control which in some localities had, up to this date, existed only in a sealed parchment.

Fall of Pavia, 774.

After he left Rome, Charlemagne returned to Pavia, which was forced to surrender unconditionally (June 774). Desiderius and his wife were taken by Charlemagne with him [2] into France, where Desiderius is said to have died a holy death in the monastery of Corbie. And thus, in the words of an ancient writer [3]: "Here was finished the kingdom of the Langobardi, and began the kingdom of Italy, by the most glorious Charles, king of the Franks, who, as helper and defender of lord Peter, the prince of the Apostles, had gone to demand justice for him from Italy. For no desire of gain caused him to wander." After he had, as king of the Lombards, received the homage of the chief men of the conquered country, and placed garrisons in Pavia and a few of the frontier cities, Charlemagne returned to France.[4]

[1] With this squares very well a passage in Hadrian's letter to Constantine and Irene, read in the second session of the Seventh General Council. Carolus Rex, b. Petro, "perpetuo obtulit possidenda (1) tam provincias, quam civitates seu castra et cetera territoria, (2) imo et patrimonia, quæ a perfida Langobardorum gente detinebantur."

[2] *L. P.; Ann. S. Amand.; Lamb.; Petav.*, etc., ad an. 774, ap *M. G. SS.*, i. *Annal. Vet. Franc.* "Langobardi de singulis civitatibus Italiæ subdiderunt se dominio et regimini gloriosi regis Caroli." *Cf.* also *Annal. Lauriss.*, ad an. 744; *Ann. Sangal. Maj.*

[3] *Cf.* an introduction to a MS. of the Lombard Laws of Rotharis, preserved in the ducal library of Gotha, and hence known as the *Codex Gothanus*. It was probably written about 807–810. (Quoted by Dr. Hodgkin, *Italy*, etc., v. 149.) We would ask the reader to observe that in this document also, Charlemagne is the 'helper,' not 'lord' of the Pope. The codex is printed, ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 6 f.

[4] There is no need to discuss the synod in which, according to Sigebert (who wrote about 1112), in his *Chronicle* (ad an. 773), the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Except that he had an overlord of a different nationality, the Lombard was left by Charlemagne wellnigh as free as he found him. But, after an inglorious existence of over two hundred years, inglorious in peace, for it produced no great man, and in war, for it never subdued all Italy, the kingdom of the Lombard now passed away for ever from before the eyes of the popes—another of the many kingdoms which the undying line of the Roman pontiffs has seen born and die! In the South of Italy, however, the dukes of Beneventum, who from this time forth assumed the title of prince, and whose territory comprised perhaps most of what was afterwards the kingdom of Naples, preserved more or less of independence for their Lombard countrymen.

Usurpation of the Archbishop of Ravenna, 774.

No sooner had Charlemagne left Italy than Hadrian was beset by political difficulties of all kinds. Difficulties incidental to the establishment of a new order of things; difficulties from within and difficulties from without. Hadrian's first trouble after the departure of Charlemagne was from those 'of his own household.' We have seen Leo of Ravenna acting independently of the Pope in the affair of Paul Afiarta. Power must have proved sweet to him. No sooner had Charlemagne crossed the Alps than the archbishop seized various cities of Emilia, expelled the papal officials and appointed his own, and tempted the loyalty of the citizens of the Pentapolis. But these latter remained firm in their allegiance to Hadrian, as they had done to Stephen (II.) III., "to whom," writes[1] the Pope to

Pope gave Charlemagne the right of choosing the Pope and of investing all the bishops throughout his dominions! The synod is a proved 'fiction.' *Cf.* Gregorovius, *Rome*, etc., ii. 371 n.; Sandini, *Disputat. Hist.*, xix. Indeed, it is said not to have been mentioned even in the original edition of Sigebert. (*Cf. Hist. des Conciles*, De Sauclières, iii. No. 687.)

[1] All this from *Cod. Carol.*, 49 *G.* "Cui (Stephano) . . . . genitor tuus et . . . . excellentia tua ipsum exarchatum sub jure b. Petri

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Charlemagne, "your father and yourself gave the exarchate. . . . And so the enemies of both of us are now striving to take away from us the power we exercised even in Lombard times." To gain over the Frank monarch to his side, Leo betook himself to Francia. He, however, obtained no satisfaction from Charlemagne, who assured the Pope that he would see that his donation was carried into effect.[1] But, convinced that the Frankish king was too occupied with the Saxons (against whom Charlemagne had to be in arms off and on from 773–804) to be able to interfere with him, Leo, on his return from *Francia*, gave out that the cities of Imola and Bologna had been given to him and not to the Pope, and continued to act as before.[2]

So that, for instance, when the Pope sent his treasurer Gregory to the aforesaid cities to bring thence to him their magistrates, and to receive the oaths of fidelity from all the people, Leo would not suffer the Pope's functionary to approach the cities. In like manner, when, by a formal official document,[3] Hadrian had appointed a certain Dominicus count of the little city of Gabellum, the rebellious archbishop sent a body of troops to seize the new count. This they did, and at the time (November 775) when the Pope wrote the letter which furnishes us with all these particulars, Dominicus was a prisoner at Ravenna.

Disloyal to the Pope, Leo, not unnaturally, seems to have been disloyal to Charlemagne also. He doubtless

permanendum tradidit." This refers, of course, to the donation at Quiercy (754).

[1] *Cod. C.*, 53 *G.*; ed. Migne, also 53, written in 775.

[2] *Cod. C.*, 54 *G.* But the Pope has full confidence that Charlemagne will endeavour to fulfil "omnia quæ b. Petro per *vestram donationem* offerenda promisistis."

[3] Ep. 55 *G.*, 56 *J.* "Præceptum ejusdem civitatis illi tribuentes."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

realised that when the Frankish king had a free hand he would have to render him an account of his rebellious conduct towards the Pope. Accordingly he seems to have lent his support to those who were desirous of ousting the Franks from Italy. At any rate this is the conclusion that, in common with Hadrian, we draw from the action of Leo, narrated by the Pope to Charlemagne in a letter[1] of October 27, 775. Hadrian had received a most important letter from John, the patriarch of Grado—so important that neither Hadrian himself nor his secretary ate or drank till they had sent it off to Charlemagne along with a letter from the Pope. This document of John, which, with great probability, has been supposed to have had reference to the rebellion of Rodgausus (Hrodgaud) of Friuli, which broke out a month or two after this, had been confiscated on its way through Ravenna by Leo. The archbishop broke the seals, made himself acquainted with the contents of the letter, and only then sent it on to Hadrian. Fully warranted by the circumstances seems the conclusion of the Pope—that Leo communicated the intelligence he had acquired by his arbitrary conduct "to Arichis, Duke of Beneventum, and to the rest of our and your enemies."

How many troubles would have been spared the popes if they could have made up their minds centuries earlier than they did to govern their dominions in a less paternal but more practical manner. If the people of our own century and country even require sometimes to be *kept* in order, how much more did the still semi-barbarian races which were in possession of Europe in the eighth century!

However, as after this[2] Hadrian never again alludes

[1] 54 *G.*, 55 *J.* "Sifoniatas (turbatas) bullas ejusdem epistolæ repperimus; a Leone primitus relecta, nobis directa est."

[2] *Cf.* Muratori, ad an. 777; and ep. 94 *J.*, 86 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to any difficulties with Leo, we may conclude that Charlemagne's ambassadors, whom the Pope was then expecting, restored his rule in the exarchate and Emilia.

These same ambassadors, Bishop Possessor and Abbot Radigaud, caused Hadrian no little anxiety, not merely because they did not arrive when he expected them, but because, "when they reached Perugia, instead of continuing their journey hither, as your excellency (Charlemagne) had ordered them, and as we gathered they would from your letters, setting us at naught, they directed their steps to Duke Hildeprand at Spoleto, and sent word to us by our missi that when they had had some converse with Hildeprand they would, according to their orders, join them (Hadrian's envoys) at our palace." Then, what was worse, despite the Pope's urgent request that they would come to him at least before they went to Beneventum, they again made no account of his wishes but went immediately from Spoleto to Beneventum, thereby, as Hadrian imagined, disgracing him and unduly elating the Spoletans. His apprehensions were, however, entirely groundless. The king's missi had not been unfaithful to their sovereign's directions: still less had Charles himself been unmindful of the Pope's interests. This Hadrian discovered when the missi, at the close of the year (775), had at length presented themselves to him: "We beg to inform your excellency concerning your most faithful *missi*, that (as we had already discovered and had by letter notified your royal power), when they had been presented to us, we found them true to your patron, St. Peter, as well as to us and to you. Hence we beg you receive them well."[1]

Next year (776) Hadrian had to ask Charlemagne Intrigues of Lombards, etc.

[1] Epp. 57 and 59 *J.*, 56 and 52 *G.* The chronology of Jaffé and not of Gundlach is here followed.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to remove from Tuscany Reginald, Duke of Clusium (Chiusi), for invading '*our city*[1] Castellum Felicitatis,' which is generally supposed to be the same as the ancient Tifernum, destroyed by Totila, and the modern Città di Castello, close to the left bank of the Tiber near its sources.

In the early part of this same year (*776*) Hadrian was brought face to face with a serious danger. Arichis, duke or prince of Beneventum, naturally full of Lombard sympathies, put himself at the head of a movement, the aim of which was to restore the Lombard supremacy in Italy. A conspiracy was formed between himself, Hildeprand, Duke of Spoleto (who was anxious to escape from any real subjection to Pope or Frank), Rodgausus (Hrodgaud), Duke of Friuli, and Reginald of Clusium, to combine in the March of *776* or *777* with Adalgis or Athalgisis, the son of Desiderius, who was expected then to land in Italy with a Greek force from Constantinople (whither he had fled on the fall of the Lombard kingdom), and to restore the said kingdom.[2] For the time being, the marvellous activity of Charlemagne dealt the conspiracy a serious blow. He swooped down upon Friuli, and Rodgausus had lost both his duchy[3] and his life before the Easter of this very year (*776*).

Throughout the greater portion of his reign Hadrian had ever to be on the watch against the intrigues of the Lombards. As long as Arichis remained unsubdued, it was only to be expected that the Lombards would rally round him and strive to regain their supremacy in

[1] *Cod. C.*, 58 *G.* "In eamdem civitatem *nostram* Castelli Felicitatis properans."

[2] Ep. 57 *G.* *Cf.* ep. 56 *G.*

[3] *Annal. Fuld.*, ad ann. 775-6; *Ann. Francor.* and *Lauriss.*, 776. *Cf.* James, *Hist. of Charlemagne*, p. 201.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Italy. But in Hadrian they met their match. His untiring watchfulness frustrated their plans. Charlemagne was kept well informed of their doings, and before they were completely matured they were invariably crushed by that equally unwearied and strong sovereign. Again, another powerful combination was formed in Italy. What made these designs all the more formidable was the fact that they had the support of Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria, who, like Arichis, had married a daughter of Desiderius. The Beneventans formed an alliance[1] with the Greeks of Terracina and Gaeta, where the patrician of Sicily was then residing, with the immediate object of subjecting certain of the papal cities of Campania to the Patricius (777). But a force sent by Hadrian checked their plots by the capture of Terracina. The effect of this was to make the Greeks at first wishful for peace; but, backed up by Arichis, who was daily expecting Adalgis from Constantinople with a Greek army, and aided by the Neapolitans, they recovered Terracina (780). In informing[2] Charlemagne of these occurrences, Hadrian assures him that he asks his aid not on account of the loss of Terracina, but lest the Beneventans should succeed in throwing off the Frankish yoke altogether. Convinced of the magnitude of the danger, Charlemagne again set out for Rome, taking with him his wife and two of his sons. One of these, Carlomann, the Pope baptised, giving him the name of Pippin. Both of them he anointed as kings. Pippin was named king of Italy, and Louis, king of Aquitaine.[3] By the joint exertions

Second coming to Rome of Charlemagne, 781.

[1] "Agnoscat . . . . præcellentia vestra, quia aliquantas civitates *nostras* Campaniæ operantes æmuli vestri atque nostri, nefandissimi Beneventani, ipsi *nostro* populo persuadentes subtrahere a *nostra* ditione decertant," etc. Ep. 61 *G.*

[2] *Cod. C.*, 64 *G.*

[3] *Annal. Vet. Franc.*, ad an. 781; *Annal. Lauresh.*, and other annals. The *Astronomer*, in his life of Louis (c. 4), says that Charlemagne

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of ambassadors from the Pope and Charlemagne, Tassilo submitted.[1] The difficulty with the Greeks seemed to be put in a fair way to being finally settled, as, in consequence of a request from Irene, who was now ruling in the East, Charlemagne's daughter was espoused to the empress's young son (781).[2] Trusting that a peace of permanent duration had now been secured, Charlemagne again set out for France, after having put the Pope in actual possession of the Sabine territory—viz., the territory about Rieti.[3]

Diplomatic minutes, 785.

Apart from the letters between Hadrian and Charlemagne regarding the Sabine territory, very little of their correspondence between the years 781–6 has come down to us. A curious fragment,[4] however, of the king's instructions to his *missi*, as to how they should behave towards the Pope, has escaped the destroying hand of time, and belongs to this interval.

The ambassadors are told to begin by offering to the Pope the respects of his son King Charles, of his daughter Fastrada, 'our queen,' of all his family, and the whole nation of the Franks. The Pope is to be thanked for informing the king of his health. For the king is happy when he hears of the safety of the Pope or of 'your people.'

thought it would be a great gain if he and his children got the royal insignia from the Vicar of the Apostles. Louis was then a very small child, "cunarum adhuc utens gestatorio." It is interesting to note that a certain Godescalcus was at this time finishing a copy of the Gospels which he had undertaken at Charlemagne's orders, and that in a few verses (ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1353) he has noted these events: the king's journey, "Ut Petrum sedemque Petri rex cerneret," Carlomann's baptism, etc.

[1] Eginhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 781.

[2] *Annal. Vet. Franc.*, *ib.*, etc.; Theoph. *in Chron.*, ad an. 774.

[3] On the negotiations regarding the cession of the Sabine territory and on the oaths of the old men that the Sabine patrimony had of old belonged to the Holy See (ep. 69 *G.*), *cf.* epp. 68–73 *G.*, ann. 781–2.

[4] Ap. Jaffé, *Cod. C.*, p. 341.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Hadrian is also to be thanked for his holy prayers, for which the king would be glad to make a suitable return. Through these same prayers and the mercy of God, the king and all his are well.

When the king's letter is presented to the Pope, the *missi* are to ask his gracious reception of it, and of the presents—such as Charlemagne could get in Saxony—which they are to show to Hadrian at his good pleasure. More valuable presents will be sent as soon as procurable.

Fresh disturbances in S. Italy, 786.

For some years, indeed, there was peace in S. Italy, but in 786 the restless Arichis, for some cause or other at war with the Greeks, received a defeat[1] from the Neapolitans when attacking one of their cities (Amalfi). But mutual dread and dislike of Charlemagne once more united these enemies. The unfaithful Tassilo was again induced to join against the common foe, and he in turn endeavoured to secure the aid of the barbarian hordes on his frontier. The breaking off of the engagement between Rotruda and the young Constantine was followed by a hearty co-operation of the ambitious Irene in the alliance against the Frank monarch (787).

Third visit of Charlemagne to Rome, 787.

But, as before, Charlemagne was at Rome in the very centre of his enemies before their schemes were ripe. After careful deliberation with the Pope[2] and with the Frank leaders, it was decided to commence operations by crushing Arichis. When the duke heard that the dreaded Frank was already at Capua, he sent to offer his submission; and, as evidence of it, his sons as hostages, and money. Charlemagne, "having more[3] regard for what was for the welfare of the people than for the man's obstinacy, granted his request, accepted

[1] *Cod. C.*, 78 *G.*

[2] Eginhard, *Annal.*

[3] Eginhard, *in vit. Car.*, c. 10; *cf. Ann. Pet.*; and a fragment of *Ann. Chesnii*, ap. Pertz, *M. G. SS.*, i.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the hostages he had sent; and for a large sum of money excused him from personal attendance. Only the younger son (Grimwald) was detained as a hostage. The elder (Romuald) was sent back to his father."

Charlemagne next turned his attention to Tassilo. That faithless prince, to gain time, sent ambassadors to induce the Pope to act as mediator between his offended suzerain and himself. Hadrian had no difficulty in soothing Charlemagne's anger against Tassilo. But when the Pope discovered that he was simply being made a tool of, he sent to let the Bavarian know that he would excommunicate him if, after all the promises he (Tassilo) had made, he did not submit; and that he would throw on him all the guilt of the spilling of Christian blood which obstinate perseverance in rebellion on his part would cause. This further introduction[1] of excommunication as a factor in politics is noteworthy. Tassilo, a Catholic prince, had been guilty of perjury and calling in to his aid pagan barbarians, a course of action most inimical to the welfare of Christendom. As the recognised Head of the Church, which all Christendom then believed that they were bound to 'hear,' Hadrian had a right to judge of the public crimes of Christian princes. 'Excommunication' was the natural punishment to be inflicted on Catholics obstinately guilty of grave offences against the Church. But since, as yet, by the public law of Christendom, no tangible temporal penalties were attached to excommunication, the threat of it would have fallen to no purpose on the ears of Tassilo, had they not soon after heard the clang of the approach of Charlemagne's army. Then, again, he was all submission. And once again, on his giving hostages,

[1] *Cf. sup.*, p. 404.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was he pardoned by the magnanimous Frank (October 787).[1]

Kindness was, however, thrown away on both Arichis and Tassilo.[2] Both were soon again plotting against the rule of their generous enemy. The rapidity of Charlemagne's movements in 787 had anticipated the arrival of any assistance for them from Constantinople. But Adalgis had never ceased labouring to get a Greek force with which to make an attempt to recover his father's throne. At length word was sent to the allies that he had obtained his end and was setting sail with a considerable force from Constantinople (788). He landed in Calabria, as the *heel* of Italy was then[3] called, to find that Arichis (†787) and his eldest son, Romuald, were dead. At the request of the Beneventans, but against the advice of Hadrian,[4] whose advice was justified not by the immediate acts of Grimwald but by his later, Charlemagne had sent back[5] Grimwald to be the new duke of Beneventum. To begin with, Grimwald was faithful and co-operated with Charlemagne's generals. For on this occasion, though he

[1] *Cf.* Egin., *in vit. Car.*, c. 11; *Annal. Lauris.*, ad an. 787, and other annals, ap. Pertz, *M. G. SS.*, i.; James, *Charlemagne*, p. 309; Muratori, *Annal.*, ad an. 787.

[2] *Cod. C.*, 83 *G.* "Arichis . . . . ad imperatorem emisit missos, petens auxilium et honorem patriciatus . . . . promittens ei tam in tonsura quam in vestibus usu Græcorum perfrui sub ejusdem imperatoris ditione. . . . Imperator autem emisit illi spatarios duos . . . . ferentes secum vestes auro textas, simul et spatam, vel pectinæ et forcipes patricium eum constituendi." This passage is interesting as showing not only the special robes, etc., used in investing a patrician, but also that foreigners, on whom the honour of the patriciate was conferred, conformed even to the Greek mode of dressing the hair. *Cf.* Erchempert, *Hist. Lang.*, c. 4, ap. *M. G. SS. Langob.*

[3] Apparently in the early part of the next century the Greeks transferred the name to the *toe* of Italy.

[4] *Cod. C.*, 80 *G.*

[5] Erchempert (born about 881), *Hist. Longob.*, c. 4 (ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

struck in again before his opponents were ready, Charlemagne himself did not go into Italy, but turned his attention to the more formidable danger and summoned Tassilo to him. Not powerful enough to disobey, Tassilo came, was condemned, and confined to a monastery. His dukedom was divided among various Frank counts (788).[1]

In Italy, supported by the dukes of Beneventum and Spoleto, Charlemagne's troops were completely victorious over the Greeks about the middle of 788; and Adalgis is said by some to have died on the field of battle. "Legend has enshrined the memory of this champion of Lombard independence."[2] This conflict practically put an end to Hadrian's troubles and fears from Lombard intrigue, and enabled him to pass the remainder of his days in comparative quiet.

Negotiations concerning Capua and other Beneventan towns 787–8.

However, before leaving the subject of Italian intrigues, for the purpose of showing more at large into what details of Italian politics the letters of Hadrian give us a view, it may be worth while to draw out from that source the account therein given of the negotiations connected with the surrender of Capua to the popes. That the story will be incomplete will only prove that it depends upon the Caroline Code.

Towards the close of the year 787 Charlemagne sent two embassies into Italy to arrange about the succession to the duchy of Beneventum (owing to the death of its duke Arichis and his eldest son in the summer) and the surrender to Hadrian of certain cities in the Beneventan territory.[3] The deacon Atto, and Goteramnus, 'the mag-

[1] Eginhard, *in Vit. Car.*, c. 11; and *Annal.*, ad an. 788. *Cf.* also *Annal. Lauriss.*, *Tilliani*, *Nazar.*, etc., ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.

[2] *Hist. Gen.*, by Lavisse and Rambaud, i. 315. *Cf.* James' *Life of Charlemagne*, 324.

[3] "Civitates partibus Beneventanis, sicut eas per vestram sacram oblationem b. Petro et nobis contulistis." Ep. 80 *G.*, 84 *J.* "Capua

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nificent Gate-keeper,' belonged to the first embassy. The second was composed of Maginarius, abbot of St. Denis, Joseph, a deacon, and Count Liuderic—both embassies thus exemplifying the king's general custom of combining clerical and lay officials as his 'missi.'

The second son of Arichis, viz., Grimwald, was in the hands of Charlemagne, and Hadrian used every effort to keep him there. "Know for certain," wrote[1] the Pope to the Frankish monarch, "that if you send Grimwald to Beneventum, you will never be able to keep Italy free from disturbances." It was equally the aim, on the contrary, of the widowed Adelperga and the Beneventans to secure the succession of Grimwald to their dukedom.

Before his death Arichis had endeavoured to strengthen his position by forming an alliance with Constantine (V.) VI. and Adalgis (Adelchis), who was at his court. To arrange the terms of the alliance, two imperial envoys landed in Lucania and proceeded to Salerno, where they had an interview with Adelperga (January 20, 788), finding, of course, that Arichis was no more. As their negotiations for the return of Grimwald were still pending, the Beneventans advised the imperial agents to betake themselves in the interim to Naples. This they did, and were received with all honours—with banners and images —by the Neapolitans.[2]

Not all the Beneventans, however, were anxious for the rule of Grimwald. A strong party in Capua were desirous of being governed by Hadrian, and a deputation had early in January waited upon the Pope to make their wishes known to him.[3] Hadrian at once wrote[4] to Charlemagne's

. . . quæ . . . . cum ceteris civitatibus offeruistis." Ep. 82 *G.*, 85 *J.*

[1] Ep. 80 *G.*

[2] Epp. 82, 83 *G.*, 85–6 *J.*

[3] *Ib.*

[4] Ep. Had., ap. *Epp. Car.* ed. *J.*, p. 345, or *M. G. Epp.*, iii. 654.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

missi, who had left Rome for the Beneventan territory, to know what steps he had better take. He pointed out to the king's messengers that at least one benefit would result if he acceded to the wishes of the deputation, and that would be that two parties would in this way be formed among the Capuans. Thus divided, they would the easier be brought to fall in with his views and those of the king. Acting on the strength of this sound conclusion, he had caused the members of the deputation to swear fealty in the 'confession' of St. Peter 'to that apostle, to us, and to the king of the Franks.'[1]

Meanwhile the *missi* of Charlemagne had experienced a variety of adventures after their departure from Rome for Beneventum about new-year's day (788). The lateness of the arrival of Count Liuderic caused the two embassies to get separated, though Hadrian had expressed his wish to them that they should keep together. Atto and Goteramnus, passing through Valva, in the duchy of Spoleto (Castro Valve, some ten miles east of Lago di Fucino), arrived at Beneventum a few days before Maginarius and his party, who were by arrangement following the course of the river Sangro. Of this embassy there is extant[2] the report which Maginarius sent to his master, and which we have cited before. On account of its interest we will let the report speak for itself.

"When we (*i.e.*, Maginarius and his two colleagues) learnt that the men of Beneventum were not disposed (towards you) as they ought to have been, we notified this to the other embassy, and asked them, if they judged it best, not to go on to Salerno before we arrived at Beneventum.

"When we reached the borders of the Beneventan

[1] "Jurare fecimus in fide ejusdem Dei apostoli et nostra atque vestræ regalis potentiæ." Ep. 86 *J.*, 83 *G.*

[2] Jaffé, p. 346.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

duchy we found there was no sort of loyalty towards your excellency. Accordingly we despatched a second letter to Atto and party to await us at Beneventum, that, as the Apostolic lord (Hadrian) had advised,[1] we might act together; and if on our arrival at Beneventum we were all convinced of the loyalty of its people, we might proceed to Salerno. But if not, we might there together discuss the Pope's interests and yours, as you had ordered.

"We had been informed that they (Atto, etc.) would await our coming. . . . But when, after journeying through a disloyal population—against whom may God be opposed—we reached Beneventum, we found that they had left for Salerno the day before.

"This distressed us very much, both because we had not our companions with us, and because those faithful to you assured us that, if we proceeded on our journey, the men of Salerno would detain us until they knew what you intended doing with Grimwald and their envoys. They, moreover, added that unless we could assure them at Salerno that you would let Grimwald be their duke, and give back to them the cities you had granted to St. Peter and the Pope, they would not fulfil your orders, but would keep us prisoners. . . .

"Thereupon I, Maginarius, feigned to be ill, and said that I could not possibly go on to Salerno. Then, with a view of getting our friends back, I wrote to Adelperga and others of the Beneventan nobility, to the effect that I wished to send on Joseph and Liuderic to them, but that they were unwilling to go without me. Hence that it would be well for them to send Atto and Goteramnus back to us, with

[1] *Cf.* the beginning of ep. 82 *G.*, 85 *J.* Charlemagne had ordered his *missi* "ut secundum nostrum apostolicum consilium partibus Beneventanis ita peragerent."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

twelve or so of the Beneventan nobility, to whom we might unfold our commission. And then, if my health permitted, I would go on to Salerno with the others; and if not, that my four companions at least would make their way thither.

"Adelperga would, however, only send back Goteramnus. And though, when we had discussed the disloyalty of the Beneventans, he wished to return to Salerno on account of Atto, we decided it was better for one to be kept a prisoner than two. And then, at cock-crow, we fled secretly, and with difficulty reached the territory of Spoleto (at Valva)."

To the information contained in this mutilated letter of Maginarius, further particulars may be added from the letters of Hadrian. The story went, says the Pope, that Atto, hearing of the flight of his companions, betook himself to a church for sanctuary. But the Beneventans soothed his fears and sent him off to you (Charlemagne), continues[1] the Pope, with a feigned offer of submission. Hadrian also assured[2] the Frankish king that he had it on the authority of the priest Gregory, who was one of the leaders of the party that wished for the surrender of Capua to the Pope, that his ambassadors were the more anxious to escape from the city of Beneventum, because it had come to their ears that they were to be treacherously murdered if they returned to Salerno.

Whether there was any solid foundation for this assertion of Gregory, the whole history of this embassy shows how weak was the hold of Charlemagne on the duchy of Beneventum. It may have been consciousness of this weakness which induced Charlemagne to yield to the violence of the Beneventans, and to let them have Grim-

[1] Ep. 82 *G.*, 85 *J.* Atto left before Jan. 20, 788, *loc. cit.*
[2] Ep. 83 *G.*, 86 *J.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

wald to rule them, to the great chagrin[1] of the Pope and the ultimate disadvantage of the Frankish supremacy.

About Gregory and his party at Capua, the extant documents of the time say no more. From the donation of Louis the Pious, however, it may be safely concluded that a slice, at any rate, of the duchy of Beneventum was made over to Hadrian, inclusive of Capua.

Hence it may be noted that, before his death, Hadrian was the ruler not only of the exarchate and the Pentapolis, but of the duchy of Rome, which we must now think of as stretching from Grosseto (Rosellæ) on the Ombrone to Capua on the Vulturno, and including Sora, Arpino, Arce, on the left bank of the Garigliano (Liris), and Aquino, Teano, Capua, which lay between the Vulturno and the Garigliano, and of the territories of Amelia, Todi and Perugia, which connected his Roman dominions with those on the Adriatic. Whether or not he had given up claims to them, he certainly was not the ruler of the duchies of Spoleto or Beneventum, of Venetia or Istria.

The 'Adoptionist' heresy.

Even whilst engaged in these political struggles, Hadrian had also to cope with religious difficulties of no mean order. He had to deal with a new heresy, or, rather, with a new phase of an old one, viz., Adoptionism, and with one which had for some sixty years been disturbing the peace of the Church, especially in the East, *i.e.*, Iconoclasm.

The beginnings of Adoptionism are wrapped in some obscurity; but they are thought to have sprung from some controversies with the little-known doctrines of a certain Migetius.[2] Among other rather wild doctrines, he taught that in the Blessed Trinity were three *corporeal* persons, that David was God the Father incarnate; Our Lord, born of the Blessed Virgin, was the second person, and that St.

[1] Ep. 84 *G.*, 87 *J.*

[2] On the doctrines, etc., of Migetius, Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. 45 f., Fr. ed.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Paul was the third person of the Blessed Trinity. His errors were condemned in a council at Seville (782), and by the Pope.[1] The heresy of Migetius would not demand our attention were it not the occasion of 'Adoptionism.'[2] The principal opponent in Spain of the doctrines of Migetius was Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo. In arguing against his errors on the subject of the 'corporeal persons' of the Blessed Trinity, Elipandus went to the other extreme, and denied that the second person of the Blessed Trinity had a real human nature at all. He held that the human nature of God the Son was only an 'adopted' nature; and hence that Jesus Christ was not the true Son of God, but only His 'adopted' son. He thus practically revived the heresy of Nestorius. For the inference from the teaching of Nestorius, that was so fatal to that heresiarch in the eyes of the people of Ephesus, viz., that Our Lady was not the Mother of God, was equally applicable to the doctrine of Elipandus. It was further maintained, by at least some of the followers of Elipandus, that the second person 'adopted' the man Christ at the time of the baptism in the Jordan, and that consequently from that moment Jesus Christ was the Son of God by 'adoption.'

One of the first and ablest of the supporters of Elipandus was Felix, Bishop of Urgel in the Spanish March, *i.e.*, in that part of the north-east of Spain which was under the power of Charlemagne. By the year 785 controversy on the subject ran high; and Spaniards in the far Asturias

[1] *Cf. Cod. C.*, Epp. 95, 96, 97 *G.*, addressed 'to all the bishops of Spain,' or to Egila, Bishop of Elvira. The Pope declares that no evil need be feared if the doctrine of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church be followed. "Si doctrinam S. C. et Ap. Rom. Ecclesiæ secutus fueris, non timebis mala," etc. Ep. 95 *G.*

[2] On 'Adoptionism,' *cf.* Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. § 390; Alzog, *Church Hist.*, ii. § 173.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

wrote in opposition to Elipandus. Speedily informed of what was going on, Hadrian wrote a long letter[1] 'to all the orthodox bishops of Spain' this same year (785). He reminds them that the Roman Church is the head of the Churches throughout the world, and that whoever severs himself from that Church is out of the Christian religion; and says he has heard that certain bishops in Spain, setting at naught the doctrine of the Apostolic See, have introduced various new heresies. They, however, must strive to keep intact the doctrine which their predecessors received from 'our holy Catholic and Apostolic See'; and hence must not allow to creep in among them the poisonous doctrines of Elipandus and his followers, "who do not[2] blush to affirm that the Son of God is an adopted son, a blasphemy which no other heretic has dared to enunciate, except Nestorius, who made out that the Son of God was a mere man." The Pope next establishes the orthodox faith by proofs drawn from the New Testament and from the Fathers.

This letter produced no effect. The heresy continued to spread. By the command of Charlemagne a synod was assembled at Ratisbon in 792. Here the doctrine of the Adoptionists was condemned. Felix retracted and was sent to Rome to Pope Hadrian.[3] In St. Peter's, in presence of the Pope, Felix again abjured his heresy.[4] He solemnly placed one written profession of faith on the Sacred Species, and another on the tomb of St. Peter; and engaged on oath to believe and to teach that Jesus Christ was the true Son of God and not His adopted son.

[1] Ep. 95 *G.*

[2] "Filium Dei adoptivum confiteri non erubescunt, quod nullus e qualibet hæresi antea talem," etc. *Ib.*

[3] *Cf. Annal. Fuld.*; *Eginhard*, etc., ap. Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. § 394 (Fr. ed.).

[4] See the original authorities cited by Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. § 395 (Fr. ed.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Returned to Spain, he returned to his errors; and, that he might be free to propagate his views, he withdrew into a part of Spain that was under the sway of the Moors. Charlemagne now began to take energetic measures to combat the advances made by the new heresy. His first step was to recall his trusty counsellor, Alcuin, from England: "Heresy[1] is spreading in our lands; make haste thou to help us." Finding, however, all his efforts to move Felix, to whom he was personally attached, quite unavailing, Alcuin advised Charlemagne to summon another council to discuss the affair. The Frankish king, who had been asked by certain of the Spanish bishops, quite in the usual style of heretics who always appeal to the civil power, to decide the controversy himself, sent their communications to the Pope,[2] begged his advice, and assembled a council at Frankfort in the beginning of the summer of 794, 'by apostolic authority.'[3] Bishops, how many is not exactly known, came from all parts of Charlemagne's dominions. Two came to represent the Pope.[4] Adoptionism was again condemned. Two refutations of it were drawn up and approved by the council. Among the decrees (*capitula*) drawn up by this council, as we shall have occasion to mention more in detail presently, there was one (the second) which condemned the Seventh General Council of Nice for teachings in reference to holy images, which were never enunciated by that Council. Hadrian also condemned the Adoptionist documents, which Charlemagne had sent him, in a letter[5] addressed to the bishops of Gaul and Spain. "As

The council at Frankfort, 794.

[1] Alc., *Adv. Elip.*, l. i., ap. Frobenius, the Prince-abbot of St. Emmeran, *Op. Alc.*, i. 882.

[2] Ep. Had., ap. Mansi, xiii. 865. [3] *Cf.* canon i. of the council.

[4] Eginhard, *Annal.*, an. 794, ap. Pertz, i.; and *Annal. Vet. Franc.*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 98.

[5] Referred to above, note 2.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

it is a question of the faith," writes the Pope, "we have been obliged to reply to the letter of the Spaniards in writing and with the authority of the Apostolic See." This letter of the Pope, and the two refutations of Adoptionism, drawn up by the Italian and Frankish bishops respectively, were sent by Charlemagne to Elipandus and the other bishops of Spain, along with a letter[1] from himself. The king of the Franks opens his letter with ardent words in praise of the blessings of 'unity.' His warrior nature displays itself in the comparisons he uses. "As the ordered array of an army and the united bravery of the soldiers strikes terror into the enemy"—doubtless Charlemagne was thinking of the effect his disciplined forces produced on the unorganised courage of the Saxons —"so the peaceful union of the sons of our holy Mother

[1] Mansi, xiii. p. 899 f.; *P. L.*, t. 98 p. 899. "Ad beatissimum apostolicæ sedis pontificem, de hac nova inventione, nostræ devotionis ter quaterque direximus missos; scire cupientes quid sancta Rom. Ecc., apost. edocta traditionibus, de hac respondere voluisset inquisitione." The attitude taken up by Charlemagne towards the Holy See, on this and other occasions (*cf. Cap.*, 28, §§ 8 and 55, ed. Boretius.), ought to have been enough to have prevented Mr. Davis (*Charlemagne*, p. 16, etc.) representing Charlemagne as exercising 'the supreme power of both kinds,' viz., of State and Church. No doubt Charlemagne exercised a great deal of power which properly belonged to ecclesiastics; but it was exercised with some dependence on the authorities of the Church, and, to a greater or less extent, on the lines of established Canon Law. In his behaviour towards the Church in his dominions, arbitrary indeed but beneficial, Charlemagne was but following in the footsteps of his predecessors, as well Merovingian as Carolingian. But even under the barbarous Merovingians, if there was interference in ecclesiastical concerns, especially in those which had a marked political side, there was respect for the authority of the Pope and the bishops. And so if we find them, on the one hand, refusing to allow a synod to be held (*c.* 644), of which they had not had previous notice (*M. G. Epp.*, iii. 212), yet, on the other, they acknowledged the binding force of Canon Law until the authority of the Pope or a synod could deal with the matter—"usque ad pape notitiam vel sinodale audientiam," *ib.*, p. 438, *c.* 540.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Church within the wall of the Catholic faith is terrible to the powers of darkness." He exhorts them to humbly search after the truth: "for it is better to be a learner of the truth than a teacher of falsehood." . . . "The faith of all Christians must be one." . . . "That the Spaniards are under the yoke of the infidel is pitiful, but that they should fall under the sway of unbelief or schism would be more so." . . . To bring them back to the unity of the faith, he had summoned a council, and "on this new invention had three or four times sent embassies to the most blessed pontiff of the Apostolic See, to learn what answer to these questions would be given by the Holy Roman Church, taught as it was by the traditions of the Apostles." As for himself, he unites himself to the great numbers and authority of the fathers of the council, to the Apostolic See, and to the ancient Catholic traditions that have come down from the early Church, rather than to the small number of Spaniards who have put forth a new doctrine. He entreats the Spaniards to do likewise, to remain with him firmly attached to the profession of the one Catholic faith, and not to consider themselves wiser than the Universal Church; and he reminds them that if they will not heed the apostolic authority and the unanimous voice of the synod, they must be accounted heretics, with whom he must not be in communion. Charlemagne concludes this letter, so full of the truest Catholic spirit, with a profession of faith drawn from the Nicene and Athanasian creeds.

This action on the part of the Frankish monarch did not, unfortunately, put an end to the heresy it was directed against. Even after the death of Hadrian, controversy on the subject was still brisk. Fresh apologies for his doctrine poured from the pen of Felix. These Charlemagne sent to Rome, and in response to the wishes

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the king, Leo III. held a council[1] of 157 bishops in St. Peter's (799). Here the doctrines of the Adoptionists were once more condemned. More effective than this, however, in putting an end to the Adoptionist heresy, was a mission which Charlemagne sent into the province of Urgel, to explain the true faith to the people. Besides bringing back thousands to the faith, they induced Felix again to present himself before a council. In the autumn of 799, at a council convened by Charlemagne, overcome by the logic of Alcuin, Felix once again renounced his errors. A second mission sent by Charlemagne to Urgel, the death of Elipandus—and Adoptionism died the death.[2]

Iconoclasm and the Seventh General Council.

Whilst combating a new heresy in the West, Hadrian was helping to deal a severe blow at another in the East. The life of one hundred and twenty years of the Iconoclast controversy may be conveniently divided into three periods. In the first, from the publication of Leo III.'s first decree against the images (726) to the death of his grandson Leo IV. (780), the Ionoclasts were masters of the situation. From that event (780) to the accession of Leo V., the Armenian (813), especially whilst power was in the hands of the Athenian Irene, the orthodox party were in the ascendant; but under Leo V., Michael II. and Theophilus, Iconoclasm was again rampant, till it was finally suppressed under Theodore (842). In 755 died miserably the tyrant Constantine Copronymus, crying out, according to Theophanes,[3] that he was already tasting of the fire which is never to be extinguished. His son Leo IV., whose attention was fully occupied by the Saracens, and whose reign was but short (775-780), only began to prove himself a persecutor a few months before his death (October 780). The supreme

[1] Héfélé, v. 147, Fr. ed.
[2] Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Église*, iii. § 176.
[3] Ad an. 767.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

power now fell into the hands of Leo's wife, the beautiful but ambitious Irene, as regent for her young son Constantine VI., Porphyrogenitus. Under Irene the 'worship' of images was tolerated at once. And in compliance with the exhortations of Pope Hadrian,[1] she decided to take measures for the restoration of the images and of communion with the West. Wars with the Saracens and Slavs prevented any active steps being taken for a few years, but at length matters were brought to a head, after a cessation of those wars, by the resignation of the patriarch Paul (August 784). On leaving his See he expressed his regret to the empress and her son that he had ever "sat in the sacerdotal throne of Constantinople, inasmuch as that Church was tyrannised over, and cut off by the other thrones from communion with them." And to the nobles he added: "Unless you assemble a general council and put an end to your errors, there is no hope of salvation for you."[2] By the empress and people, Tarasius, a layman and imperial secretary, was pitched upon to succeed Paul. Tarasius, however, after pointing out that the Church of Constantinople was anathematised as well by the other Churches of the East as by the West, and that there was need in the Church of one faith, one baptism, and concord and agreement in other ecclesiastical matters, declared that he would only accept their choice of him if the rulers would bring about a general council.[3] After some demur on the part of the partisans of Iconoclasm, the condition was agreed to, and Tarasius was

[1] *Cf.* his letter to the empress and her son, read at the beginning of the second session of the Seventh Council. He asks for the restoration of the images "recordationis causa." *Cf.* also the close of the Pope's long letter to Charlemagne, printed at the end of the Seventh Council: "Synodum istam secundum nostram ordinationem (imperatores) fecerunt."

[2] All from Theoph., *in Chron.*, ad an. 776–7. [3] *Ib.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

consecrated on Christmas Day, 784. He at once wrote to the Oriental patriarchs and to the Pope, requesting them to send delegates to assist at a General Council.[1] Irene also wrote to Hadrian a letter which is found prefixed to the Acts of the Seventh General Council (August 785), in the different collections[2] of the *Councils*. Saluting Hadrian as 'the most holy head,' who had received from Our Lord the highest dignity among the priests, as he has given us (viz., Constantine and Irene) the chief power in the State, she says that, with the advice of her priests and people, she has decreed the holding of an œcumenical council; and begs the Pope to come in person to it "as the true[3] first priest and the one who presides in the place and See of St. Peter's." If the Pope cannot come in person, he is entreated to send venerable and learned men with letters from him to represent him.

In his reply to the empress (October 785), which was read[4] in the second session of the Seventh General Council, Hadrian rejoices in her intention to restore the orthodox faith by the restoration of the images. "Blessed Peter,[5]

[1] Theoph., *in Chron.*, ad an. 776-7; and the letter of Tarasius to the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, read at the beginning of the third session of the Seventh General Council. On the reading of this letter the papal envoys said that the Pope had received a letter 'to the same effect.'

[2] Or ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 199, which is the third vol. of the works of Anastasius Bibliothec.: "utpote ab ipso nos quidem imperium, vos vero principalis sacerdotii dignitatem suscipientes."

[3] *Ib.* "Tamquam verus primus sacerdos, et is qui in loco et sede S. Petri præsidet."

[4] Not in its entirety; for, with the consent of the papal legates, certain passages in which the uncanonical election of Tarasius was blamed by the Pope were omitted. The complete letter of the Pope was given by Anastasius Bib., in his translation of the acts of this Council. (The letter will be found in Migne, *P. L.*, t. 96.)

[5] "Ipse Princeps App. B. Petrus, ... apostolatus principatum, ac principalis curæ, successoribus suis, qui in ejus sacratissima sede perenniter sessuri sunt, dereliquit; quibus et auctoritatis potes-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Prince of the Apostles, left to his successors, who were for ever to sit in his Sacred See, the chief power of the Apostolate, just as he had himself received it from Our Saviour. And it is by their tradition that we venerate the images of Our Lord, His Blessed Mother and the Saints." The Pope then at some length defends a rational use of images from the testimony of the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers, and bewails the folly of those who would forbid the honouring of images, "in which are contained the histories of Our Lord and the Saints." If an œcumenical council had to be held, the pseudo-synod (of 753 or 754), held without the sanction of the Apostolic See, must be anathematised, and a safe conduct for the Pope's legates and a declaration of impartiality must be tendered by the rulers. Hadrian also asked for the restoration of the 'patrimonies' and his patriarchal rights, which had been taken away by Leo the Isaurian, and expressed his astonishment that the 'title of universal patriarch' had in her letter been given to Tarasius by the empress. The title ought not to be employed, as it would seem to imply that the patriarch of Constantinople had the primacy which had been given by Our Lord to the Roman Church through Peter. Had it not been for his orthodoxy, the Pope could not have consented to the uncanonical election of Tarasius. To Tarasius himself, quite in the same strain, the Pope wrote another letter, which was also read in the second session of the Council.

No direct answer to the letter of Tarasius came from the Oriental patriarchs themselves, for the simple reason that, owing to the hostility of the Saracens, it never

tatem, quemadmodum a Salvatore nostro D. Deo ipsi concessa est suis contulit, etc. Quorum traditione," etc. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 96. The Greek translation weakens considerably the force of this passage.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

reached them.[1] An answer, however, came from certain 'archiereis of the East,' as they style themselves, *i.e.*, as is clear from the context and the present use of the word among the Greeks, superiors of monasteries. By the advice of these men, the messengers of Tarasius did not proceed on their journey to the Oriental patriarchs, for fear of stirring up the Mohammedans against the whole body of Christians under their rule. But they (the messengers) returned with John and Thomas, syncelli, or chaplains, of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria respectively, who were commissioned to testify to 'the apostolic tradition' of the East, 'which they knew well.'[2] "Should you wish to hold a synod," the letter continues, "be not concerned at the absence of the three patriarchs and of the bishops under them; for this is due to the threats of their temporal rulers (the Saracens), and not to their own wish. Their absence did not interfere with the authority of the Sixth General Council, especially as the Pope of Rome gave his assent to it (*concordaverit*)." . . . "To give weight to our letter, we send the synodical letter which Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, once sent to the patriarchs Cosmas of Alexandria and

[1] *Cf.* the letter next to be quoted from certain distinguished Oriental monks, which was read in the third session of the Seventh General Council. Finlay, *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 88, says, speaking of this Council: "An attempt was made to deceive the world into a belief that they (the Oriental patriarchs) were represented, by allowing two monks from Palestine to present themselves as the syncelli of these patriarchs, without scrutinising the validity of their credentials." No such attempt was ever made. The charge is simply ridiculous, and could never have been made by a man who had read the 'credentials' of the monks. Their 'credentials,' *i.e.*, the letter written by them to Tarasius, were publicly read in the third session of the Council, and explain the whole state of the case perfectly. Other remarks of Finlay on this Council are equally accurate.

[2] "Scientes liquido trium apostolicarum sedium concinentem et concordantem orthodoxiam." (Ep. read at the third session.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Theodore of Antioch; and which called forth responsive letters from them to him."[1]

An attempt to hold the council in Constantinople (August 786) failed owing to the violence of the imperial bodyguard, a band of men full, of course, of the views of Constantine and Leo. Next year, however, after Irene had disbanded the old bodyguard and formed a new one, the bishops again met, to the number of some 350,[2] at Nicæa, and held their first session in September, 787. Though Tarasius directed the work of the synod, the Pope's legates held the first place[3] in the assembly, as the acts, which they always sign first, show. The enemies of the holy images were anathematised, and the Council, at the end of the seventh session, decreed that "images of Our Lord, of our immaculate Mother, and of the Saints in any material might be placed anywhere. The oftener one looked on these representations, the more would the onlooker be stirred to the remembrance of the originals, to imitate them, and to offer his greeting and his *reverence* to them (*ἀσπασμὸν και τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν*), not the actual worship of 'latria' (*τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν*), which belonged to the Godhead alone; but that he should offer, as to the figure of the cross, the books of the holy Gospels, and to the other sacred things, incense and lights in their honour, as this had been the sacred custom with the ancients; for the honour which is shown to the figure passes over to the

[1] *Cf. sup.*, p. 364.

[2] That is the number given in the Vit. Had., ap. *L. P.*, and by the deacon Epiphanius in his discourse to the synod at its close.

[3] *Cf.* also the fragmentary life, ap. Mab., which says that the holy Seventh Council was held "imperante Constant. et Irene, *præsidente* quoque domino Had. papa per *suos legatos*." In his letter to Charlemagne on the image question, Hadrian says: "Synodum istam secundum nostram ordinationem fecerunt." (Ep., ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1291.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

original, and whoever does reverence (προσκυνεῖ) to an image does reverence to the person represented by it."[1]

At an eighth session, held in Constantinople, the decree was signed by Irene and Constantine. It is interesting to note that "the scene is represented in a Greek MS., now in the Vatican, and the young emperor (the empress is omitted) is the most conspicuous personage. In the foreground is a prostrate figure, which seems to represent the spirit of Iconoclasm that was now overthrown."[2] On the termination of the Council, Tarasius wrote[3] to the Pope (788), whom he speaks of as adorned with the high priesthood and as hastening to destroy error with the sword of the Spirit, to inform him of what had been done at the Council, how they had all embraced the confession of the truth which the Pope had sent; and how the emperors had reërected the images both in the Churches and in the palaces. The Pope's legates returned with letters from Irene and with the Acts of the Council in Greek, bearing the autograph signatures of the empress and her son.[4] Thus, for a time at least, the image question was at rest in the East.

The Franks and the image question.

But in the West it was quite the reverse. Where there had been peace on the image question there was now war. Though Hadrian did not send a formal confirmation of the Council to Irene, because his just demands, in connection with the restoration of the patrimonies and

[1] *Cf.* Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. p. 374, Eng. trans. *Cf.* the decree passed at the end of the fourth session; and cc. 9, 10 and 54 of Hadrian's answer to the *Caroline Books*. "Demonstrantes eas (imagines) . . . . honorabilem salutationem, nequaquam secundum fidem nostram *veram culturam* quæ decet sole divinæ naturæ."

[2] *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, p. 114, by Tozer.

[3] The letter is printed among the acts of the eighth session. "Prædicabatur a nobis omnibus recta et irreprehensibilis confessio, quæ nobis missa est a vobis."

[4] *L. P.*, in Vit. Had.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of his jurisdiction in the diocese of Illyricum, had not been attended to, he nevertheless received the Council,[1] and ordered its acts to be translated into Latin. His orders were obeyed indeed; but so bad a translation was made that Anastasius, the librarian, who again translated the acts, assured[2] Pope John VIII. that the first interpreters had employed such a slavish word-for-word translation that the sense of the original could scarcely ever be discovered. Up to this the Franks entertained the same rational views with regard to the use of images as was entertained then in the other countries of the West,[3] and as is entertained now in the Catholic Church. Even to this day the use of images is not so great in the West as in the East. Reflecting on this fact, and that Charlemagne was annoyed at Irene for breaking off the engagement between her son and his daughter, it need cause no great surprise that the arrival, among the Franks, of a bad translation of the Acts of the Seventh General Council caused considerable disturbances in their country. And in combating what they supposed to be the blasphemous idolatry of the Greeks, they, at least to some extent, left the 'via media' in which they had previously been, and denied that any, even relative, honour was, in practice at any rate, to be paid to the sacred images.

The *Caroline Books.*

In 790 appeared the famous *Caroline Books*, which, issued under the name of Charlemagne, are often groundlessly attributed[4] to Alcuin. These books (four in

[1] *Cf.* his letter to Charlemagne printed at the end of the Acts of the Seventh Council, and the *L. P.* "Ipsum suscepimus Synodum." Ep. ad Carol.

[2] Præfat. Anast. in *Sept. Synod.* The preface of the *Libri Carol.* speaks of the translation as "*eloquentia* sensuque carens."

[3] *Cf. sup.*, p. 375, for the faith of the Frank bishops on this subject.

[4] "On conjecture only, and contrary to evidence," says Lingard (*A.-Sax. Ch.*, i. 193). Alcuin is known to have 'adored or worshipped' the cross, like the rest of his countrymen (*cf.* Bede,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

number)[1] condemned alike the Council of Constantinople (753 or 754) for ordering the destruction of images, which the books consider useful, and the Council of Nice for ordering their *adoration*. Throughout, the *Caroline Books*, ignoring the plain distinction between adoring images *absolutely*, and *adoring them relatively*, a distinction which the Council of Nice had made clear by the use of the words 'latria' on the one hand and 'proskunēsis' on the other, speak as though the Seventh General Council had placed the 'adoration' or worship to be offered to the Blessed Trinity and to images on the same level. Hence, at the close of the preface of the first book, its authors say[2] that "they hold to the orthodox doctrine, according to which images must serve only to ornament the churches and to recall past events, while God alone must be adored, and His saints only honoured with the veneration which is their due; and hence they neither break the images with the one synod, nor adore them with the other." Throughout these books also there is displayed a great want of accuracy, and the animus of their authors[3] against

Vit. Abb., c. 17, etc.), "not," as the Saxon homilist (Aelfric) observes, "that by this word (worshippers of the cross) they understood any idolatrous worship paid to the wood or metal of which it was formed, but a worship paid to the Almighty Lord, who was fixed to the Cross for our sake" (ap. Lingard, *A.-Sax. Ch.*, ii. 99). Of Alcuin in particular we are told (*in vit.*, c. 9) that he had a habit of bowing before a cross and saying: "We worship Thy cross, O Lord, and call to mind Thy glorious passion. Have mercy on us, Thou who hast suffered for us."

[1] Ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, pp. 999–1248.

[2] Præfat. in lib. i., *ib.*, p. 1006. "Nos . . . . imagines in ornamentis ecclesiarum et memoria rerum gestarum habentes, et solum Deum adorantes et ejus sanctis opportunam venerationem exhibentes," etc.

[3] It is not known who the authors of these books really were. No one, however, supposes them to be the unaided production of Charlemagne. He says they were issued with the assent of the bishops of his kingdom. "Opus aggressi sumus cum conniventia sacerdotum in regno a Deo nobis concesso." (Præfat., *ib.*)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Eastern rulers is displayed by the absurd points[1] which they endeavour to make against them—*e.g.*, their arrogance in giving to their letters the name of 'Divalia.'[2] Other matters not at all to the point are discussed in these 'books,' such as the 'procession' of the Holy Ghost in the beginning of the third book; and some of the arguments for the worship of images, which had been adduced by some of the more simple Fathers of the Nicene Council, are crushed with pitiless logic. But in some cases the authors of the Caroline books, either in bad faith, or misled by the wretched translation that had fallen into their hands, erected men of straw for themselves, and then triumphantly demolished them. Smartly do they attack[2] the Nicene bishops for putting images and the Blessed Eucharist on the same level. The Council of Nice, however, so far from doing anything of the sort, would not even have the 'unbloody sacrifice' called the 'image of Christ';[3] for, of course, it was in their eyes Christ Himself, and not an image of any kind. Again, the Caroline books find no difficulty in annihilating the Seventh Council for *approving* of the language of Constantine, Bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, who had the courage to give voice to what the rest of the council[4] thought, and to say boldly that he paid the same homage to images as he paid to the Blessed Trinity. Constantine,

[1] *Cf.* L. i. c. 1–4 (*Lib. Carol.*).

[2] *Lib. Car.*, ii. c. 27.

[3] "Nullus app. aut illustrium Patrum incruentum sacrificium nostrum . . . . dixit imaginem corporis ejus." Such is the language of the third part of the refutation of the false synod of 753 or 754, read at the sixth session of the Seventh General Council. "Non æquiparaverunt," plainly says Pope Hadrian (c. 38) in his letter to Charlemagne in connection with these books.

[4] *Lib. Car.*, iii. c. 17. "Constantinus, episcopis cæteris consentientibus, ... absurditatem quam illi introrsus retinent latenter, hanc iste egerit patenter."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as a matter of fact, had said: "I embrace with honour the holy and venerable images, but true adoration (*προσκύνησις κατὰ λατρείαν*) I offer to the Holy Trinity alone."[1] There is no doubt that the *supposed* utterance of Constantine was what most put the Franks on the wrong tack in their estimation of the work of the Seventh General Council. And so, as we shall see presently, they were the very words singled out for condemnation by the Council of Frankfort. With glorious inconsistency, too, the *Libri* assert[2]: "Whilst in the matter of images we despise nothing except the 'adoration' of them, they (the Fathers of the Council) place all their faith in them; though we venerate the saints in their *bodies*, or rather in the *relics* of their bodies, and in their *vestments*, according to the tradition of the ancient Fathers!"

Of one thing in their reckless attack on the seventh synod the authors of the *Libri* were careful; and that was to show their loyalty to the Holy See. Anxious lest, whilst attacking a council presided over by the Pope's legates, they might be thought wanting in respect to the See of Rome, they take an early opportunity of setting forth "how much the Roman Church has been raised by Our Lord above the other churches, and how it must be consulted by the faithful."[3] Only those texts of Scripture are to be recognised which are taken from the books acknowledged by her to be canonical, and

[1] The words occur in the third session. In the version of Anastasius (Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 268) they are translated as follows: "Amplectens honorabiliter sanctas et venerabiles imagines: atque adorationem quæ per latriam, id est, Deo debitam servitutem efficitur, soli superstantiali Trinitati impendo."

Lib. C., iii. 16. *Cf. ib.*, ii. c. 28–30, where it is stated that veneration is due to the Cross, to the sacred vessels and to the Books of the Holy Scripture.

[3] *Ib.*, i. c. 6. "Dignum duximus ut qualiter sancta Romana ecclesia ceteris Ecclesiis a Domino prælata et a fidelibus consulenda sit. . . ."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

only those Fathers are to be considered as authorities who have been acknowledged by the Roman pontiffs. As the apostles were above the other disciples, and Peter pre-eminent over the apostles, so the apostolic Sees are above the other Sees, and the Roman See above the other apostolic Sees. . . . After Christ, to obtain help to strengthen their faith, all must turn to her, who has no spot or blemish, who crushes heresy and strengthens the faithful in their faith.[1] Hence, with that Church, the authors of the *Libri* would be one even in matters not of faith, as in modes of worship and singing.

The Council of Frankfort, 794.

Whether the *Caroline Books* were presented to the Fathers of the Council of Frankfort or not, it is certain that the question of the decision of the Second Council of Nice was discussed by them. For among the fifty-six 'chapters' (*capitula*) which they drew up, the second declared that the Greek synod, held at Constantinople (the last session of the Second Council of Nice was held in the imperial city), had condemned those who would not render to images the 'adoration' they rendered to the Blessed Trinity. All the bishops here present have refused to give 'adoration' to images, and have rejected the synod.[2] It is quite plain that the bishops at Frankfort were under a completely wrong impression as to what the Seventh General Council had really decided.

The *Caroline Books* sent to the Pope, 792–4.

Either in 792 or 794 the *Caroline Books* were sent to the Pope; or, rather, probably some abridgment of them.

[1] *Lib. C.*, i. c. 6. After pointing out that holy and learned men all over the world have not only not receded from the Roman Church, but in time of necessity have turned to it for the strengthening of their faith, the authors of the *Libri* add: "Quod regulariter, omnes catholicæ debent observare Ecclesiæ, ut ab ea post Christum ad muniendam fidem adjutorium petant: quæ non habens maculam," etc.

[2] *Cf.* Eginhard, *Annal.*, an. 794, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i., and *Annal. Vet. Franc.*, *ib.*, or ap. *P. L.*, t. 98, ad an. 794. The *Annal. V.* speak of the Greek synod "de adorandis sanctorum imaginibus."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

At any rate, it is quite certain,[1] from Hadrian's reply to them, that they were not sent to him in the form in which we now have them. The objectionable propositions were sent to the Pope, "to be corrected in accordance with his judgment."[2] A very lengthy reply[3] was sent by the Pope either in 794 or 795. Hadrian reminds Charlemagne that the care of the Church was given by Our Lord to St. Peter and his successors, and says that in replying to the king's communication, point by point, he will hold to the tradition of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. Hadrian then proceeds to reply to a great number of points which are by no means exactly those of the Caroline books, as we have them to-day. In unfolding the tradition of the Roman Church, Hadrian declares that time would fail him were he to attempt to enumerate[4] the churches his predecessors have built and adorned with statues and paintings, and to set forth the veneration they have paid them. The Seventh Council, he said, decided, in accordance with the teaching of St. Gregory I. and his own, that honour was to be given to holy images, but true worship (*vera cultura*) only to the Divine nature. Hence he concludes: "We accept the council. For if we did not, and men returned to the vomit of their error, who would be responsible on the great accounting day for the loss of so many thousand Christian souls but we ourselves?"[5] . . . . "We are more concerned for the salvation of souls and the preservation of the true faith than for the possession of the world." This was said by Hadrian in reference to

[1] This point is abundantly proved by Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. § 401, Fr. ed.
[2] *Cf. Conc. Paris.*, ad an. 825, ap. *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 1300.
[3] *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 1247 *seq.*, or ap. *M. G. Epp.*, v. p. 5 f.
[4] Ep. ad Carol. Ap. *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 1286.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 1291.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the claim he had made to the Greek emperor for the restoration of the confiscated patrimonies.

With this, the image-difficulty was for the time settled among the Franks. The images remained in their churches; they still continued to *honour* the cross, the book of the Gospels, etc., and, beyond all doubt, the images themselves,[1] though perhaps with less demonstration than the cross, relics and the rest. Up to this day has image-worship been practised in France through the long succession of the centuries. And as the traveller makes his way from village to village, and from town to town, throughout the length and breadth of sunny France, his mind is constantly raised to the thought of higher things by the frequently-recurring sight of the sign of our redemption or of the image of Our Lady or some Saint. Material objects indeed are they; but none so calculated to make us less material!

Before, however, leaving this question, we may be permitted to quote here a letter[2] to the Pope from our countryman Alcuin, which many think was called forth by this image controversy. The letter is assigned to the July or August of 794. Alcuin opens his letter by imploring the prayers of that "venerable man, who was illustrious

[1] *Cf. sup.*, p. 375, for the real belief of the Franks, as shown by the assent of twelve of their bishops to the decree of the Lateran Council relative to the honour to be paid to images. This action of the Frank bishops was appealed to by Pope Hadrian in his reply to the *Caroline Books* (ap. *P. L.*, *ib.*, p. 1275). There can be no doubt that had the Franks grasped the force of the decree of the Seventh Council, there would have been no difficulties in Gaul on the subject of image-worship. And if the different significations of the word 'adorare' had been made clear, *i.e.*, if proper technical terms had been at once invented in Latin, as they had in Greek, they would have comprehended the decree. More has certainly been heard in modern times of the *Caroline Books* and the opposition of the Franks to image-worship than was heard in the eighth century.

[2] *Monument. Alc.*, ap. *Bib. Rer. Germ.*, vi. p. 243.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

throughout the whole world for his goodness," and who was "the heir of that wondrous power" of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth. He confesses himself a miserable sinner (for opposing the Pope at the Council of Frankfort on the matter of the images), and prays Hadrian to absolve him from his sins. He begs God long to preserve the life 'of such a pastor.'

Hadrian and England.

In view especially of certain utterly baseless theories that many are endeavouring to have accepted in this country, the account of Hadrian's dealings with England will doubtless be more interesting to Englishmen than the Iconoclast controversy. In 773 the Pope granted the pallium to Ethelbert of York,[1] and in 780 we read in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that King Alfwold sent to him for the pallium for Eanbald, the successor of Ethelbert. A little later (786), understanding that things were not as they should be in England, Hadrian sent over to this country two special legates, George, Bishop of Ostia, and Theophylact, Bishop of Todi, "to renew[2] the faith and peace which St. Gregory had sent us by Augustine, the bishop, and they were worshipfully received and sent away in peace." There also came along with the bishops one Wighod, an ambassador from Charlemagne. What the legates did we can best learn from the letter[3] of George to the Pope. He says

[1] *Chron. de Mailros.*, ap. Jaffé, *Regest.*, ad an. 773.

[2] *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 785—translation of the *Church Hist. of England* series. *Cf. Chron. de Mailros.*, *ib.*, ad an. 786. "Legatos dirigit, ut fidem catholicam innovent et confirment," and Simeon of Durham, ad an. 786.

[3] *Mon. Alc.*, *Bib. R. Germ.*, vi. p. 155; also ap. Haddan and Stubbs. "Ille cum ingenti gaudio ob reverentiam b. Petri et vestri apostolatus honorem suscepit tam nos quam sacros apices a summa sede delatos." With a certain class of English writers nowadays, it would seem to have passed into a habit to talk about the independence of any country they happen to be treating of from the See of Rome. If what each of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that by the aid of the Pope's prayers, they at length reached England, and at once proceeded to the palace of Offa, king of the Mercians. "Owing to his reverence for Blessed Peter and your apostleship, he received with great joy both us and the sacred letters we had brought from the supreme See." They then went into Northumbria, where they found matters in a bad state, "as they were the first Roman priests who had been sent there since the time of Blessed Austin." In a council (probably at Corbridge-on-Tyne), in presence of King Alfwold, the Pope's letters to the Northumbrians were read, and various canons (some twenty in number) were proposed to the king and his prelates and nobles for their acceptance. These canons had reference to the frequent holding of synods; the careful teaching of the faith "as it had been handed down to them by the Holy Roman Church"; the election of kings; the respecting of privileges granted to churches by Rome; the abstaining from violence on the part of all such as would keep "in communion with the Holy Roman Church and St. Peter"; the abolition of the practice of tattooing, of cruelty to horses, and eating their flesh, etc. All engaged to keep these decrees, with the aid of divine grace, to the best of their ability, and the leading men confirmed the decrees by placing[1]

these authors have written were true, the Pope would not have had any authority anywhere in the Middle Ages! Mr. Watts, who wrote *Spain* in the *Story of the Nations* series, assures us (p. 158 f.) that the Pope had no authority in the early centuries of the Middle Ages in Spain. Yet we find Hadrian (*Cod. C.*, 95 *G.*) 'giving licence' to Wulchar, 'the archbishop of the province of *Gaul*,' to ordain Egila for Spain, "in partibus Spaniensis provinciæ." Abundant evidence has already been given that the Pope had authority in Spain in the early Middle Ages.

[1] At least, so we understand "in manu nostra in vice dominii vestri, signum sanctæ crucis formaverunt." Some identify this Northern council with that of 'Pincahala' (Finchale, near Durham?).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

their hands in the hands of the legates, as representatives of the Pope, and making the sign of the cross on the copy of the canons.

The letter then goes on to relate that the legates afterwards returned to Mercia; and, at a council at Calcuith (which Lingard supposes to be Chelsey), before Offa and Jaenbyret (Lambert), Archbishop of Canterbury, read, "both in Latin and Teutonic that all might understand them," the decrees that had been approved of by the council in Northumberland. "All with one accord, grateful for the admonitions of your apostleship," promised to stand by the canons. In this synod King Offa, partly from hostility to the men of Kent and to their archbishop, and partly from motives of pride,[1] tried to obtain from the council the recognition of Lichfield as a metropolitan See. As might have been expected, there was a stormy discussion.[2] But Offa was determined, and he gained the bishops to his views. Lichfield was acknowledged as the archiepiscopal See of the country between the Thames and the Humber. Jaenbyret's possessions within the borders of Mercia were seized by the king. Offa even managed to obtain the consent of Pope Hadrian to his wishes. "From Pope Hadrian," says William of Malmesbury,[3] "whom he had wearied with plausible assertions for a long time, as many things not to be granted may be gradually drawn and artfully wrested from minds intent on other occupations, he obtained (788) that there should be a bishopric of the Mercians at Lichfield." The Pope is even said, but wrongly, to have sent the pallium[4] to the successor

[1] These are motives assigned by Cœnulf, Offa's successor, and Alcuin, to whom, nevertheless, Offa is "decus Brittaniæ, tuba prædicationis, gladius contra hostes, scutum contra inimicos" (Ep. 64, ed. Düm.).

[2] *Ang.-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 785. [3] *De Gest. Reg.*, i. § 86 *seq.*

[4] *Ib.*, *De Gest. Pont.*, L. iv., and L. i.; Mat. Paris, *Chron. Maj.*, i. p. 345, Rolls Series. On these affairs, *cf.* Lingard, *A.-Sax. Church*,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the new archbishop, Higebert. It is interesting also to note that at this council Offa gave into the hands of the legates a deed by which he engaged that he and his successors should each year give to St. Peter's at Rome 365 mancuses (a mancus = 30 pennies) to supply oil for the lamps and for the support of poor pilgrims.[1]

Pope Hadrian was also called upon to adjudicate—with what result history does not inform us—between Offa and some of his political opponents, who had fled to the court of Charlemagne. In response to the repeated request of Offa to have them delivered up to him, Charlemagne sent them to Rome to have them tried before the Pope and 'your archbishop.' "For what," wrote[2] the Frank to Offa, "can be more satisfactory than that the apostolic authority should decide cases in which there is difference of opinion?" What bloodshed would be avoided if this conduct of Charlemagne were imitated by the great ones of to-day! And the Frankish monarch had every reason to believe that such a course could not be unacceptable to Offa, as Hadrian had assured[3] him that Offa's predecessors "had ever been subject in obedience and faithful love to the Pope's holy predecessors."

i. pp. 72 and 113; and *Hist. of England*, i. p. 78; Flanagan, *Hist. of the Church in England*, i. p. 167 f.; Héfélé, *Conc.*, v. Haddan and Stubbs (*Ecclesiastical Documents*, iii. p. 444 f. and 524 f.) show that Higebert was the only archbishop of Lichfield. Charters bearing his name, as archbishop, are found as late as 799.

[1] *In vit. Offæ*, ap. Wilkins, *Conc.*, i. This *Life* is generally ascribed to Matthew Paris (†1259), but it seems certain that it was already in existence when Matthew wrote. It is also to be found in Wats' ed. of Matthew Paris (1640).

[2] Ap. Bouquet, *Rer. Gall. Script.*, v., or Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 496 f.

[3] *Cod. C.*, 92 *G.*, where Hadrian remarks, "a prædecessoribus suis regibus semper subjecti in obedientia atque fideli amore sanctis prædecessoribus nostris pontificibus et nobis existentes." This letter is dated 789 by some authors.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A Frankish Pope?

Other passages in the letter just quoted are not without interest as showing that the idea of having a Pope of Frankish origin, and so presumably subservient to their king, came into the fertile imaginations of the 'Gauls' before the days of Philip the Fair or Napoleon I. "You write," says the Pope, "that it has been reported to you that we have been informed that Offa has written to suggest to you that you should drive us from Our See and install therein one of your own nation. You have further written," continues Hadrian, "to assure me that no such suggestion was ever made by Offa, whose only wish is that my paternity should be spared to govern the Church of God to the advantage of all Christians." However, the Pope goes on to assure Charlemagne, he has not heard any such reports about Offa, who could not, had he been a pagan, have conceived such ideas; and, moreover, had he heard them, he would not have believed them. And in any case: 'The Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man can do unto me' (Ps. cxvii. 6).

Hadrian and Charlemagne.

It will not be out of place here to dwell at some little length on some other of the relations between Hadrian and Charlemagne.

i. The case of Abbot Potho.

About a 'thousand paces' from the source of the Vulturno the traveller may behold the ruins of one of the most famous monasteries in Italy during the Middle Ages. Famous even in the eighth century, the monastery of St. Vincent, on the Vulturno, was at the time of which we are now writing in a most flourishing condition.[1] Founded in the midst of what was then a most wild country, by the advice of that pious hermit, Thomas of Morienna (who had been the originator of the equally famous abbey of Farfa), and destined to be plundered over and over again by the Saracens in the following

[1] "Nunc magna congregatione refulget." Paulus D., *H. L.*, vi. 40.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

century, it was in the reign of Hadrian full of monks. We can easily understand how, in their hours of recreation, the monks must have discussed the great changes which were taking place in the government of Italy. A letter of Hadrian, which tells us of a commotion in this abbey, is in many ways the most interesting document of his age, as it lets us see what men were thinking and saying with regard to what was going on around them. A charge of treason against the abbot of St. Vincent's (one Potho) had been brought to the notice of Charlemagne. However, in accordance[1] with the requirements of the canons, as the case concerned an ecclesiastic, the king referred the matter to Hadrian. The parties were duly summoned before a court at Rome, at which, with the Pope, there sat as assessors, archbishop Possessor the *missus* of Charlemagne, the abbot of Farfa, and three other abbots, Hildeprand, Duke of Spoleto, and various officials of the papal court (*nostris adstantibus servitiis*), such as the librarian Theophylactus, Stephen the treasurer, Duke Theodore, the Pope's nephew, and many others. One of the monks, Rodicausus (Rothgaud), stepped forward and said: "My lord, when we had finished Sext, and, according to custom, were singing the psalm—'Save me, O God, by Thy name'—for the king and his family, the abbot suddenly stood up and refused to sing. On another occasion, when we were walking together, the abbot asked me: 'What is your opinion of our cause? I have been expecting a sign in connection with it and have been disappointed. If it were not for the monastery and its Beneventan lands, I would count him (Charlemagne) as a dog. . . . Would that there were no more Franks left than I could carry on my shoulder.'" To all this Potho indignantly retorted: "Our congregation always prays for the king's excellency

[1] "Canonice et regulariter," ep. 67 *G.*, 68 *J.*, of May–June 781.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and for his children. And on the occasion referred to, I rose, suddenly indeed, but merely to attend to some business concerning the monastery. As for what was said during our walk, it was simply this: 'If it would not seem like desertion of the monastery and its interests, I would go to some place where I should not have to look after anybody.' Finally, with regard to the Franks, I said nothing of what he alleges against me." Rodicausus could not bring forward any confirmatory evidence of his allegations, and his charges were further discounted when it was shown that he had been anything but an exemplary character. After a most careful investigation, the abbot was at length acquitted on his own oath, and that of ten 'compurgators' (five Franks by birth and five Lombards), that he had never been 'unfaithful' to the king.[1]

The words of Rodicausus, if unjustly placed by him in the mouth of Potho, are an index of the independent spirit that was abroad at this period in the Samnite duchy, which was evidently too little in the power of Charlemagne for him to have handed it over to the Pope in its entirety, however much he may have wished to do so. It was, in practice, as much distinguished from the kingdom of Italy as the duchy of Rome and the Pentapolis.[2]

ii. The restoration of the 'patrimonies.'

As we have already seen, Charlemagne not only confirmed the Pope's supreme dominion over various parts of Italy, but also restored to him the various 'patrimonies' which belonged to the Holy See, and had been seized by the Lombards. But it was one thing for Charlemagne to decree that these estates should be given back to the

[1] *Cf.* ep. 66 *G.*

[2] *Cf.* a capitulary (95 n. 16, ed. Boretius, i. 201) of the youthful Pippin, King of Italy (*c.* 790). "De fugitivis partibus Beneventi et Spoleti sive Romaniæ vel Pentapoli, qui confugium faciunt [in Pippini regnum ex partibus Italiæ Pippino non subjectis, as the editor explains], ut reddantur et sint reversi ad proprium locum."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

popes, and another for the popes to be able to get them back from those who were in possession of them. Hence Hadrian had a great deal of writing to do before he could come into his rights in connection with some of them. In five[1] letters of the Caroline Code do we find negotiations between the Pope and the Frank king relative to the full restoration of 'the Sabine patrimony.' Sometimes 'perverse and wicked men' prevented even the envoys of Charlemagne from being able to carry out their sovereign's orders. Three years elapsed before the restoration of that patrimony was completely effected. There are also extant, at least, three letters that treat of the full restoration of the patrimonies of Rosellæ, near the modern Grosseto, and Populonium, a maritime city, on the Aurelian Way, which had belonged 'of old'[2] to the Holy See. For thus trying to regain his just rights, the charge of avarice has often been glibly thrown at Hadrian. But there is an avarice which is no avarice. It is idle to accuse of avarice a man who looks well after his own. And, as we shall see, no man ever made a better use of the money that came to him from the possessions of the Church than Hadrian. On one occasion we find him indignantly denying that he acted "from any[3] avaricious desire of acquiring even the cities which Charlemagne had given to Blessed Peter and to him."

[1] Epp. 68–73 *G.* All this constant negotiation, as Allies (*Peter's Rock*, etc., p. 459) notes, "does not show that Charles was unwilling to keep his word; but it does show the difficulty of the matter. It was a great undertaking to pacify the population in a number of cities."

[2] *Cod. C.*, 79 *G.* The Pope asks for the restoration of 'fines,' "sicut ex antiquitus fuerunt." *Cf. ib.*, 80. In this letter he speaks of the 'rights' (justitiæ) "de Populonio et Rosellas" (*sic*). *Cf.* 84, 85. In each case the Pope carefully distinguishes between the restoration of the patrimonies, which had previously belonged to the Holy See, and of certain cities of the duchy of Beneventum, which he asks for in the same three letters. He asks that the cities be given over to him, as they were included in Charlemagne's 'donation.'

[3] *Cod. C.*, 80 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The 'donation of Constantine.'

Other writers, again, accuse Hadrian of appealing to the 'donation of Constantine' in order to substantiate his claims to dominion and patrimonies. This document may be found in the principal collections of the councils. It was received into the collection of the 'False Decretals,' made by one calling himself Isidore, which appeared in France about the middle of the ninth century. In it we read that Constantine made over to the Pope not only the city of Rome and the whole of Italy, but[1] all the provinces of the West, and gave to the Roman clergy a great many privileges of honour! It is, of course, now admitted on all hands that the donation document is a forgery. But who was the author of the forgery, or when exactly it first saw the light, are questions which, if the truth be told, cannot be completely answered. Those who are not well disposed towards the popes give as early a date as possible to the composition of the donation, to insinuate, at least, that it was by producing a forgery to the Frank monarchs that the Roman pontiffs acquired their temporal power. This action of writers hostile to the popes causes authors who are attached to them to be desirous of putting the date as late as possible. However, of one thing we feel sure; no one who has attentively followed the history of the growth of the temporal power of the popes can believe that the so-called 'donation,' produced, at the earliest, in the second half of the eighth century, had anything to do with the acquisition of sove-

[1] "Tam palatium nostrum, quamque urbem Romam, et omnes totius Italiæ et Occidentalium regionum provincias loca et civitates . . . . Sylvestro concedimus." Döllinger, in his *Päpstfabeln* (of which there is an English translation by Plummer, and a French by Reinhard) says that we ought to read "*vel* and not *et* occidentalium," etc.: thus limiting the donation to *Italy*. But the next sentence of the 'donation,' which speaks of Constantine's intention to transfer his rule, '*Orientalibus* regionibus,' clearly shows that the whole *West* had been made over to the popes.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

reign power by the popes in that century. The 'donation of Constantine' no more gave a rood of territory to the popes than the 'False Decretals' gave them a tittle of spiritual power or ecclesiastical jurisdiction! In theory or on paper the donation gave the Pope temporal authority enough; but in point of fact it certainly cannot be shown that it was the means of adding anything to the practical jurisdiction of the popes. What gave the popes their temporal sway in the eighth century was the previous march of great events over which they had no control, and not a trumpery piece of forged parchment. And, as a matter of fact, when the popes' already existing temporal authority was extended by Pippin or confirmed by Charlemagne, where do we find any mention of the donation? It is indeed said that Pope Hadrian himself appeals to it. That the reader may judge for himself whether Hadrian did or did not cite the donation, we will translate the whole passage[1] which is supposed to contain the allusion. Hadrian, after asking Charlemagne to see to the fulfilment of all that he had promised to the Church, continues as follows: "And as, in the times of

[1] It occurs in a letter of Hadrian to Charlemagne. *Cod. C.*, 60 *G.*, and Migne, Jaffé, 61. The passage of the *Donation of Constantine*, which Hadrian is supposed to quote, is thus translated by Dr. Hodgkin, *Italy*, etc., vii. 149: "We hand over and relinquish our palace, the city of Rome, and all the provinces, places and cities of Italy and [or] the western regions, to the most blessed Pontiff and universal Pope, Silvester; and we ordain by our pragmatic constitution that they shall be governed by him and his successors" (*V. sup.*, n. 1, p. 467). It should be noted that to quote the example of Constantine was common with the popes (*cf.* Greg. I., ep. v. 36); and Hadrian himself, in his letter of Oct. 27, 785, to Constantine VI. and Irene, hopes that they will show themselves a new Constantine and Helena respectively; and that when Hadrian speaks of the *Western regions*, he calls them *Hesperiæ partes*. If he had had the *Donation of Constantine* before him, it seems only natural to suppose he would have written with it—*partes occidentales*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Blessed Sylvester, the Roman pontiff, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church of God was exalted by the most pious emperor of blessed memory, Constantine the Great, and *power* (*potestas*) *was given to it in these Western parts*, so in your and our most happy times may the Holy Church of God, *i.e.*, of Blessed Peter the Apostle, exult . . . . because a new most Christian emperor Constantine has arisen in these times, through whom God has deigned to bestow everything on his Holy Church of Blessed Péter, the Prince of the Apostles. Moreover, may there be restored in your day *all the other things* which have been granted to Blessed Peter and the Roman Church by divers emperors, patricians and other God-fearing men for the good of their souls and the pardon of their sins, in Tuscany, Spoleto, Beneventum, Corsica and the Sabine patrimony, and which have been in the course of time filched away by the unspeakable Lombards. We have sent, for the satisfaction of your Most Christian Majesty,[1] many of the *donations* which we have in our archives in the Lateran." In this passage, misled either by the so-called 'Acts of Pope Sylvester,' or, perchance, too highly estimating the elevated position in the Western world which the recognition of Christianity by Constantine must have given to the See of Peter, Hadrian *may* have exaggerated what Constantine effected[2] for the Holy

[1] "*Plures* donationes in sacro nostro scrinio Lateranensi reconditas habemus, ... ad demonstrandum eas vobis direximus," etc., *ib.*

[2] Some idea of what Constantine really effected for the bishops of the West, and consequently particularly for the bishop of Rome, may be gathered from the following passage of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, x c. 2, Eng. trans.): "Epistles of the emperor were issued, addressed to the bishops, with honours and superadded donations of monies; of which it may not be singular to insert extracts . . . . as we have translated them from the Latin into the Greek language." This passage from Eusebius wonderfully confirms the lists of splendid gifts to different churches in Rome, mentioned in the *Life* of Pope Sylvester (*L. P.*) as given by Constantine.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

See. But there cannot have been question here of the donation of Constantine. There would have been no need, with such a donation (even if we limit it to Italy), to send to Charlemagne 'donations' of 'other emperors' of patrimonies in Tuscany, Spoleto, etc. It is plain that throughout this whole letter Hadrian is speaking of donations of money, landed property and the like, *i.e.*, of the *patrimonies* of the Roman See and not of its newly-acquired regal sway over certain territories.

The donation, then, was not cited by a Pope before the year 1054, when Leo IX. quoted it in writing to the patriarch Michael Cerularius. And we may say with Fleury,[1] and others, that the first writer who cites it was Æneas, Bishop of Paris, in a treatise[2] that he composed against the Greeks, apparently about the year 867. Hincmar of Rheims, and his contemporary Ado of Vienne, are the next authors who mention the 'donation.' From this time forth, throughout the whole of the Middle Ages to the fifteenth century, it was regarded as authentic by both Greeks and Latins. Looking now at facts only, it appears, in the first place, that most of the MSS. of the 'donation' are of Gallic origin, as also are the most ancient of them. Fresh examination of the MSS.[3] has apparently

[1] *Hist. Eccles.*, xi., bk. 51, n. 14. Gosselin, *The Power of the Popes*, i. p. 317, etc.

[2] Ap. d'Achery, *Spicileg.* (1723), i. 113–148; Migne, *P. L.*, t. 121. "Cujus donationis exemplaribus ecclesiarum in *Gallia* existentium armaria ex integro potiuntur," c. 209, cited by Jungmann, *Diss.*, xxiii. It is a curious coincidence that whereas one Æneas was the first author to quote the 'donation' as genuine, another, Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II., was the first to seriously call its authenticity in question. (*Cf.* his *Pentalog. de reb. eccles. et imp.*, ap. Pez, *Thes. anecd.*, iv. 3, p. 679). One of the earliest, and at the same time the most solid, of the refutations of the genuineness of the donation was from the pen of our own Reginald Pecock, Bishop of Chichester (fifteenth century), in his *Repressor of over much blaming of the Clergy.*

[3] Jungmann, *Diss.*, xxiii., vol. v. p. 25.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

proved that the oldest copy of the deed, which is in the Bibliothéque Nationale of France, was written in the ninth century, and in the monastery of St. Denis. Further, though it would have been very useful to such popes as Nicholas I. and Hadrian II. in their controversies with Photius, it was not cited by the Roman pontiffs till after the middle of the eleventh century. But it was quoted by Gallic authors of the ninth century. Why, then, should we not conclude that it was forged among the Franks? A Frank would forge it as a means of defending the institution of the Frankish Empire against the diatribes of the Greeks. If Constantine made Pope Sylvester supreme in the West, then the popes could make over their rights to Charlemagne and his descendants!

Whoever was the author of the donation (very likely, as Grauert conjectures, a monk of St. Denis, near Paris, in the first half of the ninth century), it may perhaps be said that there is no convincing reason for believing that it saw the light before the ninth century, or anywhere else than in *France*. We may allow, however, with many modern critics,[1] that it may have been forged about the year 774 in the Lateran itself, and that it may have proved useful in later times to the popes by furnishing them with a ready and handy weapon for defending their rights to power they had previously acquired. Still it assuredly cannot be shown that they were ever able to add by its means to the territory they already had—a remark equally applicable to the False Decretals in the domain of the spiritual power of the popes. As a matter of fact, too, the false donation was a document not much used by the popes;[2] and it certainly cannot be

[1] *Cf.* Solmi, *Stato e Chiesa*, Modena, 1901, p. 12 *f.*

[2] And so in unison with these views we find the conclusions of an author who wrote on the *Donation of Constantine*, in the *English Historical Review*, vol. ix. He points out (p. 632) that the popes used the Donation very little indeed till the middle of the fifteenth

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

shown that it affected public opinion either in Rome or elsewhere in the eighth century.

The Pope appeals to Charlemagne (*a*) for help to enforce the laws of the Church.

But not only in his temporal difficulties did Hadrian confidently turn to Charlemagne for help. It had come to the Pope's knowledge that various Lombard bishops were in the habit of interfering with one another's jurisdiction; and that certain monks and nuns among the Lombards had thrown off their monastic habits and contracted illicit marriages. He therefore wrote to Charlemagne[1] to beg him to co-operate with him, that such disorders "might be canonically corrected in our and your times, among the whole Christian people committed by God to our (the Pope's) care." In a word, then, it may be said that these two master minds of their age, Hadrian and Charlemagne, always worked together in harmony.

This view, founded, it was believed, on a careful study of the extant documents, from which it was possible to judge of the intercourse of the Frankish king and the Roman pope, had been written down long before the publication of Dr. Hodgkin's last volume of his most interesting *Italy and her Invaders*. When, however, the author of this view read therein (p. 24): "The history of Italy during the quarter of a century before us (the last quarter of the eighth) is almost entirely the history of the strained relations between the two men, Charles and Hadrian, who had sworn eternal friendship over the corpse of St. Peter"—when he read this, he not unnaturally wondered whether prejudice had

century, and then not "to enlarge their own territorial possessions, but rather to dispose of lands newly acquired." . . . "It is evident that it was used by some popes to further their claims, but by rather fewer than has been generally supposed. Apart from the doubtful cases of Stephen (II.) III. and Gregory VII., only Urban II. and some of the popes from Nicholas V. to Leo X. (1447–1521) derived a practical benefit from the forged grant."

[1] *Cod. C.*, 93 and 94 *G.* *Cf.* 88 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

been at work and quite distorted his vision. He is content, however, to stand by his opinion, as he finds that Mr. Davis, the latest student in this country of the career of Charlemagne, has no hesitation in writing (p. 164) that the estrangements between the monarch and the Pope were but "temporary . . . . were ripples on the surface; they did not affect the broad stream of Frankish policy." For in Hadrian's own words (ep. 96 *J.*), "it is my practice to try to oblige you, as it is yours to endeavour to gratify me"; and in Charlemagne's (ep. 68 *J.*), "your interests are ours, and ours are yours."[1]

Of course it is only to be expected that for their own ends some would endeavour to disturb this harmony, and that during their long intercourse some slight differences of opinion or disagreements might arise between the Pope and his powerful protector. The letters of the Caroline Code prove that all this did really take place.

(*b*) to restore to his jurisdiction certain *judices* of Ravenna.

Two powerful officials (*judices*) of Ravenna, who had perpetrated divers excesses, and in consequence were in dread of the Pope's resentment, fled secretly to Charlemagne, trusting to make good their case by endeavouring to breed distrust between the Pope and the king. Hadrian, however, writing[2] to Charlemagne and assuring him that he does not think that anyone can sever their close friendship, asks him not to show favour to these two wicked men, but to send them to him in disgrace, that they may be tried and punished, and so that the offering (*oblatio*), *i.e.*, the donation, "made by your father Pippin and confirmed by yourself, may remain intact."

(*c*) not to allow 'the Pope's men' to go to him without permission.

On another occasion, when a similar course had been pursued by others of his Ravennese subjects, Hadrian

[1] *Cf.* epp. 59 *G.* "In vinculo caritatis et dilectione nos adnecti," and ep. 72, p. 603; 94, p. 633.

[2] *Cod. C.*, 75 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

found it necessary to write[1] in very plain terms to Charlemagne. After pointing out that if honour is due to the king's 'patriciate,' so is it also due to 'that of St. Peter'—a form of speech used on this occasion only by the Pope, Hadrian affirms that the 'donation' of Pippin, which he here calls a holocaust, must be rigidly observed. And if Charlemagne does not object to 'his men,' bishops, counts or others, coming to the Pope, either to obey the Pope's orders or from their own free will; so neither does the Pope object to his men going to the king, either to pay him their respects or to seek justice. But as the king's men do not come 'to the threshold of the apostles' without the king's permission, the Pope's men ought not to be suffered to approach the king without the Pope's permission. And he begs the king to exhort those of the Pope's men who come to him to remain subject to the Pope, as he (the Pope) always exhorts those who come to him from the king to remain steadfast in their loyalty to their sovereign.

(*d*) against the king's detention of a legate of the Pope.

Strongly, too, had the Pope to protest against the detention of one of his legates (a certain Anastasius, the Pope's chamberlain) by Charlemagne. The legate had made use of some language (*importabilia verba*) which the king could not brook, and had in consequence been thrown into prison. Hadrian pointed out[2] that the Lombards were boasting that such conduct on the part

[1] *Cod. C.*, 94 *G.* "Sicut vestri homines sine vestra absolutione ad limina app. neque ad nos conjungunt, ita et nostri homines qui ad vos venire cupiunt, cum nostra absolutione et epistola veniant." The independent sovereignty of the Pope is surely stated clearly enough here.

[2] *Cod. C.*, 51 *G.* If the order and dates assigned to the undated documents of the *Caroline Code* by its latest editors, Jaffé and Gundlach, are correct, the Pope's remonstrance must have produced an immediate effect, as Anastasius returned to Rome the same year (775). Ep. 54 *J.*, 53 *G.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Charlemagne showed that the friendship between the king and the Pope was at an end, that such action was indeed wholly unheard of, and that the legate ought to be sent back at once to the Pope, to be punished by him according to his deserts.

(*e*) against the presence of the king's representatives at the election of the archbishop of Ravenna.

On the death of Gratiosus, Archbishop of Ravenna (778), ambassadors of Charlemagne were present at the election of his successor. Against this Hadrian protested[1] as an uncanonical proceeding.

But, in general, as we have already insisted, there was complete harmony of action and unbroken friendship between the Pope and the king. At the request of the latter, we find Hadrian ordering[2] the archbishop of Ravenna to expel all Venetian traders from the Pope's territories in those parts; granting[3] him marbles and mosaics from the exarch's old palace at Ravenna, for his church at Aix-la-Chapelle, and sending[4] him a copy of the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, mathematical and other masters,[5] and cantors to teach the Roman chant.

Mutual regard of Charlemagne and the Pope for each other.

These books and masters were wanted by Charlemagne as aids for the furtherance of that literary Renaissance, which, with the assistance of the practical Northumbrian Alcuin, who showed himself a skilled organiser, the enlightened monarch was much more anxious to promote among his subjects than he was to extend his regal sway over kingdoms. Feeling deeply, and complaining in his capitularies (cap. 30)

[1] *Cod. C.*, 85 *G.*
[2] *Ib.*, 86 *G.*
[3] *Ib.*, 81 *G.* *Cf.* Eginhard, *in vit. Car.*, c. 26.
[4] *Ib.*, 89.
[5] Charlemagne fixed these at Metz. (*Vit. Had.*, ap. Mab.) *Cf. Monach. Sangall.*, i. c. 10, 11. This author, who has preserved scarcely anything worth knowing, wrote about 883. He tells us stories about Charlemagne's throwing away the 'green part' of cheese, thinking it was nasty, and having to be told it was the best part of the cheese! *Annal. Lauriss.*, ad an. 787, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 171; John, the Deacon, *in vit. Greg. I.*, l. ii. 7–10.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that the neglect of his predecessors had wellnigh resulted in the extinction of learning, he made every effort to revive it. He realised that there could be no civilisation without religion and learning. In all this the Church, the Pope, went before and along with the King. Charlemagne proclaimed to the world (*c.* 769) that his first capitulary was issued at the instigation of the Pope. Of his legislative enactments, even those "dealing with commerce, education, the administration of justice, seem to be inspired by contact with Rome," says his latest English biographer. "Each visit to Italy was followed by important reforms in Church or State. Sometimes the king returns with artists, teachers, theologians in his train; more often we discern that the general sense of responsibility as the custodian of a great Christian society is quickened in him, by the lofty ideas which Hadrian, greater in his words than in his acts, communicated to the patrician of the Holy See" (p. 155).

If what the Frankish monarch accomplished in advancing the cause of learning were to be estimated by any modern standard of actual results, it might be thought he effected but little. But if it be measured, as it should be, by what his labours afterwards made possible, then the debt which European learning owes to him can scarcely be overrated. He revived sound principles and ideas on the subject of learning. It was again placed by him on a pedestal, as something to be admired and imitated. He proclaimed it the star by which men who would rise to eminence in Church or State must be guided.

And if the learning which Charlemagne encouraged was a culture which had reference for the most part directly to the service of religion, it was at the time none the less important. Nay, it was then on that very account but the more important. The Teutonic rulers of Europe, at that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

time still rather wildly independent, had an instinctive reverence indeed—as the Germans markedly have to this day—for religion and its ministers, but for little else besides. Civilisation and learning they could be only got to esteem, in so far as it was connected with religion. However, it is no part of our plan to go into the general question of the Carolingian Renaissance. Still less is it our business to enter into details on the subject. But as the Annals of Lorsch and John the Deacon, the biographer of Gregory the Great, give us very lively details on the subject of the Roman Cantors taken to Francia by Charlemagne, one is the less prepared to pass them over in silence, as they show in what light the Frankish ruler regarded Rome.

The Gallic and Roman cantors.

On the occasion of Charlemagne's third visit to Rome (787), the services at Easter time brought out the proverbial jealousy of musicians. The Franks (*Galli*) declared that their singing was more tuneful than that of the Romans. The latter retorted that they rendered with great exactness the Gregorian chants, which the Franks simply murdered. When the dispute was brought before Charlemagne it grew hot. "Relying on the presence of their sovereign, the Franks loudly jeered the Romans, who, trusting to their superior knowledge, promptly dubbed their opponents fools and asses, and reckoned that the teaching of St. Gregory was a rather better guide than Gallic stupidity. To bring this sort of aimless bickering to a point, Charlemagne asked his cantors which was better and purer, the fountain-head or the streams which flow at a distance from it. 'The fountain-head,' was the unanimous answer. 'Do you return then to the fount of St. Gregory, for you have clearly corrupted the music of the Church,'" was the order of their king. Accordingly when he returned to Frankland, he took

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with him two Roman cantors as well as two Gregorian antiphonaries, which had been presented to him by the Pope. Although, on account of what John, the deacon, calls (ii. 10) 'Gallic levity,' it took some time to reform the chant of the Franks, it was at length accomplished through the zeal of the Roman tutors (who also taught the Franks the organ), and through the capitularies (cap. 22, 30, 117) of the Frankish king. But, at the same time, if the national prejudice of the Roman deacon could be trusted, the result of these combined efforts cannot have been very gratifying, *if* the 'beery throats' of the Franks were only made capable of producing noises "like the sound of waggons rumbling over the stones—*quasi palustra per gradus confuse sonantia*" (*ib.*, 7)!

Also at Charlemagne's request we find the Pope bestowing the pallium on Ermenbert,[1] Bishop of Bourges, and on Tilpin,[2] Archbishop of Rheims; and ordering[3] a three-days' prayer of thanksgiving (*triduanas litanias*) for the conversion of the Saxons throughout his dominions. And in return we find Charlemagne constantly doing favours for the Pope and sending him presents of all kinds[4]—crosses, horses, 'strong and shapely'; wood and metal for the church repairs that Hadrian was carrying on, and money.

Their friendship for one another was further shown by that especial sign of mutual esteem—the frequent interchange of verses of their own composition. Some

[1] *Cod. C.*, 91 *G.*

[2] Flodoard, *Hist. Rem.*, ii. c. 17, ap. Jaffé, 2410 (1845). This is the 'Turpin' whom the eleventh or twelfth century author of the romantic history of Charlemagne assigned as the writer of his romance. Pope Hadrian commissioned Tilpin to examine Lullus, Bishop of Mayence, to see whether he also was worthy of the pallium. Flod., *ib.*

[3] *Cod. C.*, 76 *G.*

[4] *Cod. C.*, 79, 81, 65, 78; Eginhard, *in vit. Car.*, c. 27.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of those of Hadrian to Charlemagne have already been quoted. Among those of Charlemagne to Hadrian mention may be made of the dedicatory lines accompanying a present of a copy of the Psalter in golden letters, which Charlemagne had had prepared for the Pope. The king (*P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1349) begs the Pope's acceptance of his present—"vile foris visu, stemma sed intus habens"; for it contains the sweet songs of David. He gives it to him that he may think of him when he touches it, and pray for him. In turn he prays that the Pope may live long to rule the Church by his dogmatic skill.

> Hoc vobis ideo munus pie dedo sacerdos,
> Filius ut mentem Patris adire queam.
> Ac memorare mei precibus sanctisque piisque,
> Hoc donum exiguum sæpe tenendo manu.
> Et quamquam modico niteat splendore libellus,
> Davidis placeat celsa camœna tibi.
> Rivulus iste meus teneatur flumine vestro,
> Floriferumque nemus floscula nostra petant.
> Incolumis vigeas, rector, per tempora longa
> Ecclesiamque Dei dogmatis arte regas.

There is no need to pause to observe that this interchange of poetical presents, besides being an indication of the mutual friendship of Pope and king, is a sign of no little value of the expanding literary aspirations of the times.

Death of Hadrian 795, and grief of Charlemagne.

Charlemagne's love for the Pope came out in strong light on the death of the latter (December 25 or 26, 795). "He wept for him," says[1] his biographer, Eginhard, "as if he had lost the son or brother that was dearest to him." "And after he (the king) had ceased his mourning for him, he begged prayers to be offered for him, and many times sent alms to other countries for his benefit,"

[1] Eginhard, *in vit. Car.*, c. 19.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

adds an old monastic chronicle.[1] Of this 'holy thought' of Charlemagne we have an interesting example in a letter which he wrote[2] to our King Offa. In it he says that he has sent presents to various episcopal Sees of England "as an almsgiving on account of our apostolic lord Hadrian, earnestly begging that you would order him to be prayed for; not as doubting that his blessed soul is at rest, but to show our esteem and regard for our dearest friend." Just before Hadrian died, Charlemagne was preparing to send him a large share of the spoils he had taken from the last stronghold of the robber Avars. He was going to send it, as he told (*Mon. Car.*, p. 355) Pope Leo, to whom it was afterwards sent, that "the greatness of the gift might show the strength of his love for Hadrian, and that the steadfastness of their sweet familiar intercourse might be made manifest to the eyes of many." He also, perhaps with the aid of Alcuin, wrote the Pope's epitaph,[3] which he caused to be inscribed in letters of gold on black marble, and sent to Rome, where it may still be read. The epitaph begins: "Here the Father of the Church, the glory of Rome, the illustrious author, Hadrian, the blessed Pope, has his rest. . . . Born of noble parents, he was nobler by his virtues. . . . The Church he enriched with his gifts, the people with his holy teaching. . . . Rome, chief city of the world, he re-erected thy walls. . . . You were my dear love, you do I now mourn. . . . I join our names together, Hadrian and Charles. I, the King; you, the Father. . . . With the Saints of God may your dear soul rejoice."

[1] *Annal. Lauresh.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 36.

[2] *Mon. Alc.*, *Bib. Rer. Germ.*, vi. p. 286.

[3] *Annal. Vit. Franc.*, ad an. 795; the epitaph (given *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1350) is still to be seen in St. Peter's, "built into the wall on the left of the main entrance in the vestibule of the basilica." (Gregorovius, ii. 460.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Hadrian as a builder.

The prosperity and the long peace which Hadrian enjoyed enabled him to turn his attention to the needs of his city itself. And to judge from the long list, given in the *Book of the Popes*, of what he accomplished in that direction it was evidently well that he did take up the work, or the city would have fallen into ruin. In what he accomplished as a builder he was quite a rival of the fame of his great namesake, the Roman emperor.

He began first, it would seem, on the walls, which he completely renovated. As he left them, they were of even greater extent than the walls of the emperor Aurelian. For the accomplishment of the work, the Pope brought together men from the whole patrimony of the Church, from Tuscany, Campania and the districts around Rome. These, with the Romans themselves, encircled the city with a strong wall defended by some four hundred towers. This work cost[1] the Pope a hundred pounds weight of gold.

Churches.

We have not space here to relate all that Hadrian, whom his biographer calls 'a lover of the Churches,' did in the way of rebuilding, repairing, redecorating and refurnishing churches and cemeteries. The curious in this matter will find the detailed account in the *Book of the Popes*, or copious particulars in Miley or Gregorovius. Among the many offerings which Hadrian made to

[1] *L. P.* The number of the towers, etc., with which the walls were furnished was counted by a pilgrim to Rome about the year 800. From the place where the MS. notes of this visitor to Rome were found, viz., in the library of Einsiedeln, by the great Benedictine scholar Mabillon, he is generally referred to as the 'anonymous of Einsiedeln.' (*Cf.* Mab., *Vet. Analecta.*) *Cf.* Miley's *Hist. of the Papal States*, i. p. 386 f. Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., ii. p. 385), speaking of this restoration, gives way to deductions drawn from 'inner consciousness.' As there were no emperors to protect the antiquities (like Constans II., doubtless!), "portions of priceless reliefs and statues *must* have fallen a sacrifice to the lime-kiln." That, too, though we are expressly informed in the *L. P.* that 'lime' was one of the items of great expense to the Pope.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

various churches for their decoration, we may instance, as illustrative of much that has gone before, a crown which he hung (774) before the tomb of St. Peter. He caused it to be inscribed with some dozen verses, which set forth that Our Lord, in His care for Church and State, gave His sheep to Peter to tend, and he in turn handed them over to Hadrian. The Roman patriciate He gave to His faithful servants—to Charlemagne, who received it from the bounty of Peter. It was for the king's prosperity that this crown was offered.[1]

To carry out his works, Hadrian spared no expense. As the portico to St. Peter's running along the river from the gate of the same name was too narrow for the convenience of the people, the Pope resolved to build a new one. Over twelve thousand blocks of travertine were laid as a foundation in the bed of the river for the new colonnade. Similar colonnades were constructed by the Pope between the gates and the Churches of St. Lawrence and St. Paul, both outside the walls. "Very great indeed," is said by his biographer, "to have been the number of workmen employed by the Pope."

Aqueducts. But of all the things most useful for the inhabitants of a large city, there is nothing to equal abundant supply of pure water. The Lombards, however, when they besieged Rome in 756, under Aistulf, had done their best to deprive the Romans of that priceless boon. The aqueducts were in ruins. One of the first works undertaken by the

[1] Some of the verses (with the emendations of De Rossi) run thus:
Tradit (Cœlorum Dominus) oves fidei Petro pastore regendas,
Quas vice Hadriano crederet ille sua.
Quin et Romanum largitur in Urbe fideli
[Patriciatum] famuli[s], qui placuere sibi.
Qu[em] Carolus [merito] præcellentissimus [et] Rex
Susc[e]pit, dextra glorificante Petri.
Cf. Grisar, *Analect. Rom.*, i. 85.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Pope, after the fall of the Lombard kingdom, was to repair (776) the *Trajana* aqueduct, known in Hadrian's time as the *Sabatina* from the fact that it conveyed the water of the Sabatine Lake (Lago di Bracciano) to the Janiculum. The words of the Pope's biographer tell his work in the matter of this aqueduct with some detail. "For some twenty years (from the siege of 756) the aqueduct—known as the Sabatina—and the leaden duct (*centenarium*) that conveyed its waters to the atrium of St. Peter's, and to the baths close by (where our brethren, the poor of Christ, come to receive alms and to be washed at Paschal time), and by which the mills on the Janiculum hill were worked, had been in ruins. And as a hundred arches, and those of great height, had been destroyed, there seemed to be no hope of the repair of the aqueduct. The Pope, however, gathering together a great many men, undertook the repair of the aqueduct; and such care did he expend upon it, and the renewing of the leaden duct, that by the blessing of God the water again flowed abundantly as it had done of old." Under the name of the *Acqua Paola*, this aqueduct still supplies water to the same mills and to the famous fountain of Paul V. The aqueduct, which bore the name of *Jobia*,[1] and which had also been destroyed at the same time as the Sabatina, was in like manner renovated by the Pope. His vigorous hands also restored the *Claudia*, which supplied the Lateran basilica, among other places, with its water. With the aid of a great host of men from Campania, the *Claudia*, the ruins of which still form one of the most striking features of the

[1] It was a branch of the Acqua Marcia (now the Acqua Pia), for the supply of the baths of Caracalla. It crossed the Via Appia, over the arch, wrongly called the arch of Drusus, near the Porta S. Sebastiano. The name Jovia, or Jobia, was given to it from some restoration effected by Diocletian (Duchesne, *L. P.*, i. 519).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Campagna near Rome, again refreshed the city with its waters. Nor did the good Pope relax his efforts till, by the restoration of the *Aqua Virgo*, still in use,[1] "he had supplied almost the whole city with water by means of that aqueduct." In every age the popes and the Catholic Church have ever gone on with courage, ever fresh, erecting buildings to the honour and glory of God, and for the benefit of mankind. And if a country is dotted throughout its length and breadth with ruins of such buildings, they have certainly not been destroyed by Pope or priest.

'Domus cultæ.'

Another effort made by the Pope for ameliorating the condition of the people consisted in an attempt to improve the cultivation of the Campagna. He continued the work begun by Pope Zachary in founding 'domus cultæ' or farm colonies. The *Liber Pontificalis* gives us the history of the foundation of six such institutions. The one of them in which the Pope took the greatest interest was called 'Capracorum.' It was situated apparently in the old territory of Veii, and was some fifteen miles from Rome. The Pope had there inherited an estate; and, after he had added to it very considerably by purchasing various properties adjoining it, he formed the whole into a farm colony. An extant inscription shows that its people took part in the building of the walls of the Leonine City under Leo IV. Broken up in the eleventh century, its name still survives in Monte di Capricoro and in the plain of Crepacore, near the river Treia and the village of Campagnano. Its produce the Pope assigned under pain of anathema to the perpetual use of 'our brethren the poor of Christ.'[2] For the

[1] *L. P.* "Tantam abundantiæ aquam effudit (Virgo), ut pene totam civitatem satiavit."

[2] "Quam domocultam Capracorum cum massis . . . . et omnibus

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

use of the farm people, he built and "dedicated to God his Maker, under the name of St. Peter," a Church, to which, with the greatest ceremony, attended by his court and 'by the Roman senate,' he brought a great many relics of the saints. With the profits of this colony, the Pope ordained that at least one hundred poor persons should be fed in the portico of the Lateran, where were depicted on the walls various pictures illustrative of alms given to the poor. Each person received a loaf of bread, two glasses of wine, and polenta (*carnem de pulmento*).

The last of the six 'colonies' was that of St. Leucius, which Mastalus, the primicerius, left to the Pope for the poor out of his hereditary estates, 'for the good of his soul.' This 'colony' was situated on the Flaminian road, about five miles from Rome.

The *Book of the Popes* also tells of various Deaconries for the relief of the poor which Hadrian founded and endowed or improved in various parts of the city. By his work in this direction, the number of these charitable institutions was brought up to eighteen. And as to the titular churches (in Hadrian's time twenty-two) there were already attached cardinal priests, so, later on (towards the close of the eleventh century), cardinal

ei pertinentibus statuit per Apostolicum privilegium sub magnis anathematis obligationibus, ut in usum fratrum nostrorum Christi pauperum, perenniter permaneat." *L. P.* Further on we are told that the anathema was published with the concurrence of the College of Cardinals (una cum sacerdotali collegio). Of the remaining four *domus cultæ*, two went by the name of Galera; and of these, one was somewhat south of the modern village of Galera, and lay between the great east road (Via Aurelia) and the Via Clodia, a branch of the Via Cassia to Bracciano; and the other has left a trace behind it in the Ponte Galera station, six miles from Porto. The Domus C. Calvisianum is placed at Solforata, some fifteen miles from Rome, between the Via Ardeatina and the Via Laurentina. Close to the Calvisianum is found that of S. Edistus.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

deacons were attached to the eighteen deaconries. We can have no difficulty in believing the Pope's biographer when he assures us that Hadrian "arranged everything usefully for the benefit of the poor."

Hadrian coins money.

Whatever conclusions are come to with regard to the alleged coining of money by popes Gregory III. and Zachary, no one doubts that Hadrian I. at any rate caused coins to be struck. Several specimens of his silver denarius of unquestioned authenticity are to be found in the Vatican collection and elsewhere. The series of papal silver money begins with Hadrian. The extant examples of his denarius show two types. The rarer type may be said to correspond to the coins (?) of Gregory III. and Zachary, even though its examples are round and of silver. For as with the *coin* of Gregory III., Hadrian's coin of the rarer type bears on the obverse a cross and the words *Hadrianus Papa*, and on the reverse, divided by bars, the words *Sci Petri*. This striking similarity goes far to support the arguments for the genuineness of the *coins* of Hadrian's predecessors. The coins of the other style were evidently modelled on the type of money current in Italy at the time. On the obverse is a bust of the Pope,[1] showing, according to some, the head uncovered, with a crown of hair (*i.e.*, the crown of the tonsure), but no beard. However, to the uninitiated, at least, it seems as if the head were surmounted by headgear of some sort. On either side of the bust there are the letters I B, of which no one apparently knows the meaning. The words D N Adrianus P P (Dominus noster Adrianus Papa) complete the one side of the coin. The centre of the reverse is taken up with a cross above two steps, and with the letters R M (Roma), one on each side of it. Round the edge are

[1] Very few of the other papal coins of the first series are stamped with the bust of a Pope.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the words *Victoria D N N* (Domini Nostri), which refer to Our Lord Jesus Christ. Below the cross are the letters C O N O B, the meaning of which is so much disputed. The best signification, perhaps, which has been given to these letters is the following, taken from Cedrenus :— *C*ivitates *O*mnes *N*ostræ *O*bediunt *B*enerationi.[1]

These denarii are often spoken of as 'grossos' (said to be so called because they are equivalent in value to a number of smaller coins), and are worth five 'bajocchi,' or about threepence. They were the most valuable coins then in common circulation in Rome. They are of the size of our sixpence, but somewhat thinner.[2]

Buried in St. Peter's.

Hadrian was buried in the Church he had done so much for—the basilica of St. Peter's—on the day after his death, *i.e.*, on December 26, 795.

Character of Hadrian.

After the eloquent facts we have narrated of the life of Hadrian, there will surely be no need of expending many words in setting forth in express terms the character of this pontiff, one of the greatest who have adorned the chair of Peter.

For does not, for instance, the plain declaration of his rights, whether spiritual or temporal, before prince or bishop, proclaim the calm courage of the man? No one will fail to have noted that he was not slow in standing out for his temporal rights[3] as well with

[1] *Cf.* Pizzamiglio, *Prime monete papali*, p. 42. With good reason, in our opinion, does he believe that the money of the rarer type belongs to the short period of Hadrian's reign before the downfall of the Lombard kingdom ; the rest to the time when the victories of Charlemagne had made his position secure.

[2] *Cf.* Cinagli, *Monete*, etc., p. 2 ; Promis, *Monete dei R. P.*, p. 32 ; and Pizzamiglio, *l. c.*, p. 38. The last-named author supplements even Promis to some extent.

[3] He will not have his subjects going off to Charlemagne *without his leave*, even if they only go to say what is good of him. "Sed neque eis neque quolibet homini nullatenus in nostra adversitate

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Charlemagne as with Constantine and Irene. In matters of spiritual jurisdiction, too, he was certainly no less firm. He would not have Charlemagne interfere in the election of the archbishops of Ravenna, and in set terms explained his position among the bishops of the world to the Frankish monarch. "There is no one but knows how great authority has been granted to Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to his most Holy See, so that it has the right of giving authoritative decisions in every case; and no one has any right to override its sentences. The See of Blessed Peter has the right of loosening whatever may be bound by the decisions of any bishops at all, through whom the care of the Universal Church is referred to the one See of Peter, and every member is kept joined to the Head." Mullinger,[1] indeed, thinks this passage is an interpolation, as it is too papal in tone! No further notice will be taken of this groundless thought than to observe that such conjectures are equally competent to do away with the whole *Codex Carolinus*, and then to support the said passage by a second from another letter of Pope Hadrian published by Hampe.[2] The letter is addressed to Maginarius, the abbot of St. Denis, to whom the Pope had granted some privilege (no doubt as a recognition of his services when acting as one of Charlemagne's *missi* to Rome), which had been attacked, among others, by the powerful bishops of Milan and Aquileia. "It is

præberemini consensum; sed statim, si tales repperissetis, et hominem et causam ad nostrum judicium mitteremini." Ep. 98 *J.*, to Charlemagne.

[1] The author of *The Schools of Charles the Great*, London, 1877. Needless to say the latest editor of the *Codex Car.*, Gundlach, makes not the slightest allusion to the want of authenticity of any part of this letter (98 *J.*, 94 *G.*). His ed. is as late as 1892.

[2] *M. G. Epp.*, v. p. 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

plain, from the tradition of the Fathers, that it (the Holy Roman Church) holds the chief place (*principatum*) in the world. This position, obtained by the word of the Lord, the Blessed Apostle Peter has ever held and still holds, and it is acknowledged to be his by the Church (*ecclesia nihilhominus* — sic — *subsequente*). If, then, the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch are subject to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church—the more that it was by the consent of the same Roman Church that the Church of Constantinople obtained the second rank, and that the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch, which had previously been above the Church of Constantinople, did not presume to resist after the Roman Church, their head, had given its assent—what are those unhappy and wretched pseudo-bishops going to do, who, resisting the privileges of the Holy See, as your holinesses have done, rob themselves?" Whether this letter seems papal in tone or not, its editor, Hampe, assures us that its authenticity has been demonstrated, and that, as his references[1] show, its substance was, after all, proclaimed by Pope Gelasius I. in 495.

What need to say Hadrian was charitable? His was a charity that would stand test. For he was not content with giving alms to the poor, which to a rich man may be no great sacrifice, but he gave his personal services, which to people in position costs a great deal more. Was the city of Rome devastated by an extraordinary flood of the Tiber (December 791)? The Pope

[1] With the assertion of Hadrian that the See of Constantinople took the second place among the patriarchs, with the consent of Rome, Hampe compares a similar assertion of Gelasius (ap. Jaffé, 664). *Cf.* ep. 92 *G.* "Nos . . . . sedem apostolorum adepti, vice b. Petri . . . . tenentes atque cuncto populo christiano (*sic*) nobis a Deo commisso regentes, non ab hominibus neque per hominem electi sumus, sed per J. Christum vocati."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was not content with praying for its cessation, prostrate on the ground, but he took provisions in boats to those who, by reason of the depth of the water, could not leave their homes! And when the flood had subsided, the Pope went to visit in their houses those who had suffered most, to console[1] them. Did he hear of a fire in the city, he was there, though it were 'first thing in the morning,' working away endeavouring to extinguish the flames.[2] When we recall his prompt restoration of law and order in Rome on his accession, his successful struggle with the Lombards, and with heresy in the East and West, his gigantic works undertaken for the renovation of the city, his coining of money,[3] and generally his labours in the direction of fixing the extent of papal rule in Italy and of settling its system of government in more or less newly-acquired territory, what necessity can there be to dilate on his vigour, energy and promptness of action? And his zeal was in accordance with both knowledge and prudence. His piety was of the solid kind that "prays as though everything depended on God, and works as though everything depended on oneself." His amiability was such that he was as much the friend of the great Frankish sovereign as of the poor of Rome. In an age when it is the fashion with many to consider that all in the Middle Ages were superstitious, it may be well to note that Hadrian writes to praise Charlemagne for holding of no account the visions of a certain monk of the name of John (ep. 88). 'In talent and education' he was 'the foremost man in Rome.' To Charlemagne's

[1] *L. P.* "Postmodum vero arefacta aqua, omnes ex ipsa regione Via Lata (which had suffered most) in domo consolatus est."

[2] See what is said in the *L. P.* of the exertions of the Pope in the case of a fire at the Church of Anastasius.

[3] *V. sup.*, p. 486.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

poetical letters he "sometimes replied[1] in verse; and specimens of these poetic effusions still remain. Written in acrostics, they are neither in expression nor metre below the level of their time."

The popes of the eighth century.

Looking back for a moment at the popes of the eighth century, we have to gladden our sight the lives not only of good men, but even of men at once good and great. Gregory II., "one[2] of the brightest characters of modern history," Zachary, and Hadrian were men who stand out in beautiful relief in the history of the age in which they lived. The true greatness of Hadrian was not dimmed even by the glory of Charlemagne, perhaps the only really great lay sovereign of the age. The non-Catholic author last quoted says[3] of the popes of this period, that they "appear to have merited their elevation by their virtues; and, deserted by the feeble court of Constantinople, the Romans withdrew their respect and confidence from the emperors to repose their obedience on nearer protectors."[4]

The principal event of the eighth century.

The last proposition of the preceding quotation naturally leads us to emphasise the acquisition of temporal power by the popes as the event of the most far-reaching consequence in this century of their history. After two centuries of what we may describe as anarchy in Italy,

[1] Gregorovius, *Rome*, ii. p. 414.

[2] Such is the language of even Col. Proctor, *Hist. of Italy*, p. 11.

[3] *Hist. of Italy*, p. 11.

[4] With this, compare the causes of the temporal power ("Estimation of those who were so often its (Rome's) preservers") enumerated by the Jewish writer Sugenheim, quoted by Allies, *Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood*, p. 425—a work the writer of these pages only came across when he had completed this volume. The work of Mr. Allies, just quoted, gives, from a very thorough analysis and comparison of the facts of the history of the period, a very lucid exposition of the position of the popes in Church and State during the existence of the Lombard kingdom, and of the causes that brought that position about.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the popes emerge as rulers of a very considerable part of it. The powerlessness and tyranny[1] of the exarchs and the eastern emperors, and the lust of territory on the part of the savage Lombard, on the one hand, and the beneficent conduct of the popes on the other, were the true cause of the acquisition of sovereign power in temporals by the popes. And here we cannot refrain from quoting in this connection a few eloquent words from Diehl. In his *Justinien*, a work as attractive and instructive from the number and beauty of its carefully selected illustrations as valuable from the excellence of its matter and the grace of its style, he writes (p. 627) thus of the popes of the sixth century: "In everyday life it was the Church which, from the products of its rich and admirably-managed estates, supported the city: by the hospitals which it built, by the works of charity which it multiplied, by its daily and inexhaustible beneficence; it was the Church which reanimated and consoled the wretched; and so, in that Rome which it defended and kept alive, slowly did it prepare and legitimatise the authority it was one day to exercise therein. Under the rule of Justinian, indeed, it had cruel experience of the rigour of imperial despotism; but the day was to come when the Roman pontiff would (for ever) free himself from the grasp of the Cæsaro-papism of Byzantium." Even before the close of the sixth century that day had already dawned. The first Pope of whom we have written, the great Gregory, was already practically independent of Constantinople. Hadrian, with Charlemagne as his protector, was, in right and in fact, lord and master both at Rome and Ravenna. It was no longer Ravenna that sent to Rome its civil and military officials, its *judices*,

[1] *Cf. Hist. Universelle*, i. p. 199, by Lavisse and Rambaud, authors who have no Catholic sympathy.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

magistri militum, and its dukes. But it was the Pope who set over Ravenna its archbishop as its ruler in temporal as in spiritual concerns,[1] who sent thither his dukes and his counts, his *judices* and his *actores*, who there with authority settled all matters which came up for consideration.[2] Equally absolute was the civil jurisdiction of Hadrian within the City of Rome. It is true that there were to be found therein the most notable of the institutions of antiquity. But it was rather that their names were heard on the lips of men than that their power and influence really survived. If the greatest of the Goths (Theoderic) infused new life and honour into the Senate, it was extinguished in the blood of the senatorial families by a revengeful successor, who felt that his nation was being crushed for ever by the *Roman* general Narses. Hence have we already heard the great Gregory bewailing its disappearance. And if from time to time in this history we have come across *the senate*, it can only have been at most a kind of municipal council, and it was probably, during the two centuries of which we have written, only a name for the class of the nobles.[3]

In the same way, during the pontificate of Gregory I.[4] as during that of Hadrian,[5] we encounter *the prefect of the City*. But before the days of Gregory, Boëthius could lament that in his time the prefect was but an empty

[1] At least that is the general opinion. In the dearth of documentary evidence with which we have to contend, this point cannot be said to be quite certain. *Cf. Cod. C.*, ep. 86 *G.*

[2] *Cf. ib.*, ep. 49 *G.*, the most important authority on this point. "Judices ad faciendas justitias direxit." *Cf.* also epp. 55 and 75.

[3] Hence Paul I. (*Cod. C.*, ep. 24 *G.*) could offer to Pippin the salutations of the three orders — the clergy, the nobility, and the people in general. "Salutant (vos) cuncti sacerdotes . . . . et *cunctus procerum senatus* atque diversi populi congregatio."

[4] Ep. ix. 16, al. x. 6. "Gloriosissimus Johannes præfectus Urbis."

[5] *L. P.* in vit. Had., §§ 13, 63.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

name.[1] In the days of Hadrian his jurisdiction was limited by the ruling authorities among both the clergy and the military, by the primicerius, secundicerius and the others, soon to be known as the *judices de clero* or the palatine judges,[2] on the one hand, and by the *magistri militum* and the dukes on the other; and was apparently confined to dealing with criminals who did not belong to either the clerical or military circles.

Though, then, for the time, the popes at the close of the eighth century were free from all external control, whether in the city or out of it, they were not free from trouble. It is with the popes as with us all, we get rid of one trouble only to be assailed by another. Their difficulties were henceforth for many ages to spring largely from within, from the aristocracy. Now that the popes had extensive temporal sovereignty, it was only natural that the great families of Rome should use every means to get the power of the Papacy into their own hands and to keep it there. And they did! The violent action of Duke Toto on the death of Paul I. is only an earnest of much worse to come. Still, even with the certain assurance of bringing fresh difficulties upon themselves, it was only to be expected that the popes would not tamely endure the oppression of Pavia and Constantinople.

Submission to the Lombards was not to be thought of. If the Italians instinctively hated the Goths,[3] "the most enlightened of the barbarians,"[4] they and the Romans

[1] "Magna olim potestas, nunc inane nomen est," iii., Pros. iv., quoted by E. Rodocanachi, *Les Institutions Communales de Rome sous la Papauté*, Paris, 1901.

[2] The *palatinus ordo* is spoken of by Leo IV., c. 853, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, v. 599.

[3] "Indigenæ . . . . maxime odissent Gothos," Procopius, *De bello Goth.*, i. c. 8.

[4] "Unde et pene omnibus barbaris Gothi sapientiores semper extiterunt," Jornandes, *De rebus Geticis*, c. 5.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

especially abhorred and detested the Lombards. They were an altogether impossible nation for a people with ever so little civilisation to live under. Up to the very end of their sway in Italy they waged war with as much barbarity as they did when they first descended upon the peninsula. The binding obligation of an oath they never understood. Such improvement as had taken place among them was, of course, due to the teachings of Christianity, which seems to have been adopted by the nation at large during this century. The Christian influence brought to bear by the popes on their legislation, and on that of other Western peoples, is an argument of the beneficent power of the Papacy, at once as striking and irrefragable as free from declamation. In stringing up the marriage laws, Liutprand avers:[1] "This ordinance have we made because, as God is our witness, the Pope of the city of Rome, who is the head of the Churches of God and of the priests in the whole world, has exhorted us by his epistles in nowise to allow such marriage (with a first cousin's widow) to take place."

It has been truly said that the temporal power of the popes is the only example in history of the acquisition of such power without arms, and of its preservation without violence. Well was it for the world that Rome was not overcome by the Lombards, and that it passed from under the sway of the tyrannical East to the paternal, often too paternal, rule of the popes. With the conquest of Rome by the Lombards, civilisation and Christianity, in the West at least, would have been, if not quite destroyed, yet certainly retarded for many a decade of years. For if Italy and Rome, even in that age a source of light to

[1] Leg., l. v. 14, ap. *R. I. S.*, i. pt. ii. I have used the translation of Hodgkin, *Italy*, etc., vi. 394. *Cf.* Capit. 19, ed. *M. G. H.* (Boretius, i. p. 44), of Charlemagne.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the West, had been reduced to the direst extremity by the Gothic wars; if 'to bend the rigid minds of the Goths'[1] the wretched remnant of the Italian people had been brought to the verge of financial ruin, still, no doubt, even under a Greek exarch, matters would have gradually improved. For, on the close of the Gothic war, Justinian not merely boasted that he had freed Italy from 'the tyranny,' had restored to it 'perfect peace,' and had taken all the needful steps to repair 'its disasters,'[2] but he erected such monuments in Ravenna and other places as to furnish models calculated to raise the standard of art. But to 'the extraordinary decadence' in 'all Art,' which had begun during the Gothic campaigns, the Lombard conquest 'immensely contributed.'[3] One result of the victories of Belisarius and Narses had been the introduction, along with Greek influences generally, of Byzantine Art. And with the distress caused by the Lombards, Italy and Rome had to be content with the poorest productions of that Art. For there was nothing there at this period to tempt the Greek artist to leave Constantinople; on the contrary, there was every reason to make him keep away from it, "because Italy was then a synonym for 'land accursed and desolate'; Italians for miserable impoverished slaves, and their rulers for ignorant, avaricious, cruel barbarians, destructive of the very elements of civilisation."[4] The famous letter of Agatho to Constantine Pogonatus shows how much the popes re-

[1] An inscription by Narses, cited by Diehl, *Justinien*, p. 200.

[2] *Justinien*, p. 200, citing the emperor's *Novels* and *Pragmatic Sanction*.

[3] *Architecture in Italy, from the sixth to the eleventh century*, by R. Cattaneo, London, 1896. This decadence, we are assured, lasted till the end of the ninth century, and in some parts of Italy even later, even till into the eleventh century.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 27.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

gretted this decay in the arts and sciences of civilised life. All that men could do to arrest it, that they did. What is the *Book of the Popes* but a list of works undertaken by the popes in every department of art? From the days of Gregory to those of Hadrian I. they sent forth books and masters to the whole West; and to Rome, in search of all that a zeal for increased civilisation could make men desire, came monks and princes from the furthest bounds of what was then called 'the parts of the Hesperiæ.' Civilisation in the West would have been dealt a fatal blow had the Eternal City fallen beneath the sway of the ferocious Lombard.

And had Rome remained under the control of the despots of Constantinople, its patriarchs, the popes, the great upholders of liberty of conscience, would have been as much ecclesiastical puppets as the patriarchs of Constantinople. And, humanly speaking, there would, moreover, have been in the Chair of Peter, as there were in the See of Constantinople, patriarchs as ready, at the will of a proud or ignorant emperor, to do all that lay in their power to play fast and loose with the sacred doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, as to smash images. But, by the decrees of God, Who watches over His Church, "the snares were broken" and the popes were freed. Freed as well from the Lombard as from the tyrants at Constantinople.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

APPENDIX.

THE TWO LETTERS OF GREGORY II. TO THE EMPEROR LEO III. ARE THEY GENUINE?

THAT Gregory II. did write to Leo on the subject of his Iconoclastic decrees is undoubted. It is expressly stated by Theophanes, and by the *Book of the Popes*,[1] when we are told that Gregory III. addressed '*admonitory* letters' to Leo, "with all the authority of the Apostolic See, as his predecessor of blessed memory had already done," to withdraw him from his errors.

Now there are extant two letters of acknowledged *comparatively satisfactory* MS. authority, purporting to be the very letters actually written by Gregory II. It is allowed, therefore, by those who deny the authenticity of these letters—*e.g.*, by Dr. Hodgkin[2]—that "we may without any constraint either way from documentary testimony turn to consider the internal evidence afforded by the contents of the Epistles."

Turning, then, to the letters themselves, is there anything in them that tells for their being genuine? There is. The historical facts alluded to in them, such as the destruction of the famous image of Our Saviour at Constantinople, the length of Leo's reign (ten years) before he began his Iconoclastic campaign, etc.,[3] are in harmony with those related by documents of certain

[1] In vit. Greg. III., *ad init.*

[2] *Italy*, etc., vi., p. 502.

[3] The letter mentions the capture of Ravenna by the Lombards. Now, while it is certain that it was captured by them *about* this time, the exact date of its capture cannot be assigned from any of the sources at our disposal. It cannot, however, be proved that it did not take place about 727, viz., the time indicated by this letter of Gregory.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

authenticity. And, what is more important, "several of the arguments used"[1] by Gregory, in addressing the synod of 727, "have so great a similarity with some passages of the two letters of Gregory to the Emperor,"[2] that it is hard to resist the conclusion that the author of the address and the letters are one and the same. Again, in the same connection, Theophanes states that in the 'doctrinal letters' which Gregory wrote to Leo, the Pope pointed out that "the emperor ought not to issue any ordinances in regard to the faith, and ought not to alter the ancient dogmas" . . . . and also 'censured' and 'reprimanded[3] the Emperor Leo for his impiety.' The two letters in question are well summed up in the above words of Theophanes. They certainly *reprimand* the emperor, and the words: "It is not the business of the emperor to publish decrees concerning the faith, or to alter the old doctrines," not only are to be found verbally in the two letters, but they form the leading thought in them. It was the strong tone of the letter which impressed itself on the mind of the author of the *Liber Synodicus* (ninth century). He says that the Pope addressed to the emperors arguments at once numerous and powerfully expressed—ἐλέγχοις πολλοῖς καὶ σφοδροῖς χρησάμενος (ap. Labbe, vi. 1462). Finally, the letter of Gregory to Germanus, which is certainly genuine, as it was read in the Seventh General Council, has a strong family likeness with the disputed letters! Possibly it was selected to be read in preference to the others, out of deference to Constantine and Irene, as it is certainly less severe on Leo than the others, though it also says some strong things about him. All, then, that we know of or might infer as to the contents of the letters of Gregory is to be found in the two letters that we now have. So much for the positive arguments for their authenticity.

With regard to the arguments urged against their genuineness, some have been answered in the text. The chief one is the alleged coarseness of their style. Here it may be observed that any want of politeness there may be in the Greek version of the letters, such as we now have them, is *certainly* aggravated by the way

[1] And cited by Pope Hadrian I. in a letter to Charlemagne (ap. Mansi, xiii. 759).

[2] Héfélé, v. 302, Eng. trans.

[3] The *L. P.*, *sub fin.*, uses the phrase "scriptis commonuit."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in which they have been, by some writers,[1] rendered into English. As far as we can judge, the most 'spicy' passage in the two letters is the one where the Pope points out to Leo that he is a laughing-stock even to the children, and that if he were to go into one of their schools, the little ones would throw their tablets at his head, should he tell them he was the persecutor of images! "And so," adds Gregory, "you will learn from the foolish what the wise could not teach you." It was, of course, absolutely necessary for the Pope, if he would produce any effect on the rough, rude, uneducated Leo, to write to him in a very different strain to what his courtly namesake wrote to Maurice. And, moreover, the times themselves had become rougher; and the popes, as we have seen, had received scant courtesy from the emperors in many instances since the days of Gregory I. Further, to make ruler and subject, there must be a reciprocity of duties. And the fact that the emperors had been unwilling or unable to show themselves guardians of their people in Rome had of course deprived them of any right to their obedience. And hence we might expect a very different letter from a practically independent ruler, as Gregory II. was, than from his great predecessor. If these reflections are borne in mind, and no *unnecessary* force given to the original by translation, the letters will at most only be set down as strong and straightforward—though certainly blunter than any previously addressed to Constantinople from the papal chancery.

Some of the other objections to the letter are trivial. It is objected that Ozias is made to destroy the brazen serpent instead of Ezechias,[2] and David to bring the brazen serpent into the *Temple*, whereas it is true the temple *proper* was not then built. Forgers do not make mistakes such as the above.

With regard to difficulties from statements of fact, the chronological note at the beginning of the Pope's first letter is urged as an objection. According even to our opponents'

[1] *E.g.*, by Dr. Hodgkin. For instance, παῦσον may well be translated 'Shut up!' in one of Lucian's dialogues; but there is not the slightest need, with Hodgkin, to translate it so in these letters of Pope Gregory—the less so that, in one case, the words immediately preceding are, "Give ear to our lowliness."

[2] See page 191, note 2.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

way of reading the statement,[1] all that can at best be urged is that it is *improbable* that Leo would write on theological matters to the Pope from his camp where he was proclaimed emperor. But the *theological matters* would simply be a declaration of his orthodoxy in a letter which Leo might very well write to the Pope to inform him of the claim he was making to the throne! Duchesne (i. 414) further objects that the place where the emperor's letters are preserved is set down in this letter as 'the *confession* of St. Peter,' and not the archives of the Vatican. But as it was not an uncommon practice at this period for the popes to lay important letters on the *confession* of St. Peter (*cf.*, *e.g.*, *Cod. Carol.*, ep. 45, ed. Gundlach), it may easily have been that, at least for a time, such letters may have been preserved in some receptacle on or near the *confession*.[2] And when the same learned author asks who does not see, under the name of Septetus (a Western prince who is stated in the first letter of Gregory to have desired the Pope to come and

[1] If the passage be taken as Héfélé reads it (v. 300, Eng. trans.), the said statement only strengthens the arguments for the genuineness of the letters!

[2] That such was in fact the practice is asserted by that distinguished scholar, the late Paul Fabre (†1899). In a paper on *La Bibliothèque Vaticane*, inserted in a recent publication (*Le Gouvernement de l'Église*), he says: "Depuis longtemps l'usage s'était introduit de conserver auprès de la Confession le texte des engagements qu'on prenait envers l'Apôtre, tels que les professions de foi des papes et des évêques, les donations faites à S. Pierre," etc. (p. 183). It is most interesting to find our own Ceolfrid, the successor of S. Benet Biscop (*cf. sup.*, p. 83), dedicating a book to the *confession* of St. Peter. He had caused three copies to be made of a bible "which he had brought from Rome, one of which, on his return to Rome in his old age, he took with him as a gift," says Bede (*Vit. abbat.*, n. 15; *cf. De sex. ætat.*, an. 720). This 'gift' of Ceolfrid still exists. It is the famous so-called *Codex Amiatinus*. By the skill of De Rossi the text of its dedication "to the venerable body of S. Peter" has been restored. It runs:

> "Corpus ad eximii merito venerabile Petri
> Quem caput Ecclesiæ dedicat alta fides
> Ceolfridus Anglorum extremis de finibus abbas
> Devota affectus pignora mitto mei."

Fabre, who quotes this (p. 182), says: "As the present of Ceolfrid was principally intended as a mark of gratitude and devotion to the Apostle, it was hence destined for his tomb" (p. 183).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

baptise him), an imaginary king of *Septas*, that is to say, of Ceuta, which to a Byzantine forger would represent the most out-of-the-way corner of the West—it must be answered that the connection is not acknowledged by all. For some see in Septetus a possible German chief converted by St. Boniface. Though the Roman fortress 'Ad Septem Fratres' used in ancient times to occupy the site whereon is now the Spanish town of Ceuta, or Sebta, and though this was often called *simply Septem*, by the time that Gregory II. became Pope it had fallen under the power of the Saracens and was known as Sebta. It seems to the last degree fanciful to suppose that a Greek forger at Constantinople would fix upon such an out-of-the-way place, which would not naturally be before his mind at all, and then coin an imaginary name from it. A forger would surely find out a real name of some heathen prince.

Finally, Gregory speaks of Iconoclastic disturbances in Constantinople in the presence of Vandals, Sarmatians and men from Mauritania and Gothland. 'Vanished nationalities'! exclaim our opponents. Possibly so. But the individuals of at least some of those nations had not vanished, or as yet been absorbed in the new nations. Considering that Carthage was only finally captured by the Arabs in 698, men from Mauritania, for instance, who had actually witnessed the fall of Carthage, might easily have been in Constantinople in the year 727. The same remark applies to the Vandals. As late as the ninth century certain Goths in Mœsia (Mæso-Goths) kept a separate existence and spoke Gothic (*Europe in the Middle Ages*, by Thatcher and Schwill, p. 30); nay (*ib.*, p. 29), even to the sixteenth century, Gothic was spoken by the Goths of the Crimea, whose ancestors had not been driven out by the Huns. Speaking strictly of the West, there was a Gothia or Gothland in the south-east of France in the time of Charlemagne; and so we find Theodulphus of Orleans, who died about 821, writing (in Parænesi ad Judic.) that the *Goths* of Narbonne claimed him as a relation. To us, at least, therefore, it appears that the intrinsic 'arguments against the genuineness of these two letters are not of equal weight with the *general* arguments that can be urged in their favour.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INDEX.

ABBOTS *nullius*, 259 n.
Adalbert, heretic, 239, 243.
Adalgis, 405, 433.
Adelperga, 435.
Adeodatus, Pope, 17 f., 19.
Adoptionism, 439.
Afiarta, Paul, 389, 401 f.
Agatho (St.), Pope, 24–48.
Aistulf, King, 233, 291, 302 f., 305 f., 312 f., 317.
Alatri, town, 371.
Alcuin, 445, 458, 475.
Aldhelm (St.), abbot, 85.
Alfanus, 208.
Anastasius, Papal Legate, 474 f.
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 7 f., 9, 212.
Anglo-Saxon Pilgrims to Rome, 148 f.
Annals, 226.
Antipodes, 247.
Antoninus, Patriarch of Grado, 211.
Aquileia, Schism of, 95, 166 f.
Arcarius, Papal Officer, 104.
Arichis, Duke of Beneventum, 428, 433.
Artavasdus, Emperor, 251.
Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester, 8.
Ausfred, Bishop of Siena, 274.
Austerfeld, Council of, 34.
Autchar, duke, 298.
Authi, envoy, 354.

BARBIANA, island, 212.
Bede, Venerable, 83.
Benedict Biscop, 24 f., 501 n.
Benedict, of Milan, 139.
Benedict (St.), Pope, 54–63.
Benedict (St.), Body of, 259.
Benedict, of Soracte, historian, 233 n.
Beneventum, Duke of, 344 f.
Boniface (St.), 155 f., 213 f., 234 f., 322 f.
Brithwald, 82.

CABINET CYCLOPEDIA OF HISTORY, quoted, 279.
Caedwalla, King, 81.
Calcuith, Council of, 460.
Calistus, Patriarch of Aquileia, 211.
Canterbury, Primacy of, 212.
Cantors, Gallic and Roman, 477 f.
Capracorum, farm colony, 484.
Capua, town, 434.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Carloman, King, 234, 254, 302.
Caroline Books, 452 f.
Ceolfrid, abbot, 83, 148.
Charity of Zachary, 274 f.
Charlemagne, King, 405 f., 422 f., 429 f., 463 f., 472 f.
Charles Martel, 218 f., 224.
Childeric III., King, deposed by the Franks, 267.
Christoforo, Patriarch of Grado, 96.
Christopher, primicerius of notaries, 362 f.
Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, 297 f.
Classis, 171.
Clement, heretic, 240, 243.
Cloveshoe, Council (749), 257.
Cœlian Hill, 17.
Coenred, King of Mercia, 130.
Coins of Hadrian, 486.
Coins of Zachary, 276 f.
Colman (St.), 75.
Conon, Pope, 68–76.
Consiliarius, Papal Officer, 104.
Constans, Emperor, 4 f., 6.
Constantine IV., Pogonatus, Emperor, 37 f., 41 f.
Constantine, deacon of Syracuse, 73 f.
Constantine, Pope, 127–140.
Constantine V., Copronymus, 251.
Constantine, Antipope, 362 f., 366 f.
Constantinople, Mock Synod of, 321.
Corbinian (St.), 152 f.
Corbridge-on-Tyne, Council at, 460.
Cosmas, Bishop of Epiphania, 354.
Cosmas, Emperor, 183.
Cottian Alps, 111 f.
Council, Sixth Ecumenical, 23 f.
Cumæ, 169.
Deacons, Regionary, 103.
Deaconries, 485 f.
Decretum Pontificis, 55.
Defensors, Papal Officers, 103.
Denis (St.), Monastery of, 300.
Desiderius, Duke of Istria and King, 317 f., 333, 344 f., 376 f., 390 f., 400 f.
Dialogues, the, of St. Gregory, 275.
Dispensator Ecclesiæ, Papal Officer, 103.
Dominicus, Count of Gabellum, 425.
Domus-cultæ, 263.
Donation of Charlemagne, 410 f.
Donation of Constantine, 467.
Donation of Pippin, 301.
Donatus, Patriarch of Grado, 167 f.
Donus, Pope, 20 f.
Droctegang, abbot, 296.

Eadbert, King of Northumbria, 340 f.
Ecgwin, Bishop of Worcester, 130 f.
Ecloga of Leo the Iconoclast, 174.
Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, 440 f.
Elvira, Council of, 180.
England, 212, 459.
England and Rome, 340 f.
Ermenbert, Bishop of Bourges, 478.
Ethelbert of York, 459.
Eudo, Duke of Aquitaine, 165 f.
Eutychius, exarch, 194, 210.

Fantuzzian Fragment, 419 f.
Farfa Abbey, 113, 463.
Farm colonies, 484.
Felix, Archbishop of Ravenna, 128.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Felix, Bishop of Urgel, 440 f.
Forthred, abbot, 340.
Frankfort, Council of, 442, 456.
Franks, 302 f.
Fulda, monastery, 250.
Fulrad, abbot, 313.

GALLESE, 216.
Gentilly, Synod of, 355 f.
George, a priest, 205 f.
George, Bishop of Præneste, 363.
George (St.), finding of head of, 262.
Gerbert, abbot, 352.
Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 148, 195.
Germany, Christianity in, 156 f.
Gisela, daughter of Pippin, 342.
Gisulf, Duke of Beneventum, 107.
Gracilis, tribune, 371.
Grado, Patriarch of, 211, 390.
Gratiosus, chartular, 372.
Greeks, 320 f.
Gregory II., Pope, 142–202.
Gregory II., attempts on life of, 184.
Gregory II. and Gregory I., likeness between lives of, 144.
Gregory III., Pope, 203–224.
Grifo, Rebellions of, 265.
Grimo, abbot of Corbie, 220.
Grimwald, of Bavaria, 154.

HADRIAN I., Pope, 394–497.
Heathfield or Hatfield, Synod of, 25.
Hildebert, Bishop of Cologne, 323.
Hildeprand, King, 232.
Hilderic III., King, *see* Childeric III.
Hugbald, 352.

ICONOCLASM, 445.
Image Worship, 175 f., 364, 452 f.
Ina, King of Wessex, 150 f.
Indiculum Pontificis, 56.
Irene, wife of Leo IV., 445 f.
Istria, Duchy of, 417 f.

JANUARY, first, pagan observances of, 235.
John, Bishop of Lappa, 15.
John of Grado, 417, 426 f.
John, Patriarch of Constantinople, 147 f.
John the Silentiary, 293.
John V., Pope, 64–67.
John VI., Pope, 105–108.
John VII., Pope, 109–123.
Justinian II., Emperor, 72 f., 110 f., 136.

LATERAN, restoration of, 261.
Lawrence (St.), Basilica of, 326.
Leo, Archdeacon, 376, 401 f., 424 f.
Leo, the Iconoclast, 172 f.
Leo (St.) II., Pope, 49–53.
Leontius, 92.
Letters of Gregory II. to Leo III., 498.
Leucius (St.), farm colony, 485.
Liftinae, synod, 238.
Liutprand, 198, 216, 227.
Lombard Tuscany, 416.
Lombards, 169, 186, 292, 356 f.
Lul, 324.

MACARIUS, of Antioch, 61.
Maginarius, missus, 435 f.
Mansionarii, Papal Officers, 104.
Maria (S.) Antiqua, Church, 115.
Marinus (priest), 344.
Martel, Charles, 218 f., 224.
Mass, Decree concerning, 201.
Maurice (St.), Monastery of, 299.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Maurus, Archbishop of Ravenna, 12 f.
Mecitius or Mizizius, elected emperor, 6.
Medeshampstede, monastery, 7.
Migetius, heresy of, 440.
Minor events of Reign of Gregory II., 162 f.
Monte Cassino, monastery, restored, 163, 257.

NARNI, 172.
Nicæa II., Council of, 450.
Nidd, Synod of, 36.
Nomenclator, Papal Officer, 104.
Nothelm, Archbishop of Canterbury, 212 f.
Nympha, estate of, 252.

ODILO, or Otilo, Duke of Bavaria, 215, 248, 266.
Offa, son of king of East Saxons, 130, 461.
Officials, Papal, 102 f.
Ordo Romanus, 103.
Oswin, King of Northumbria, 7.
Otranto, town, 345.

PAOLUCCIO ANAFESTI, first Doge of Venice, 96.
Pascal, 77 f., 80.
Patrician of the Romans, 315 f.
Patrimonies, restoration of, 465 f.
Pavia, town, 407, 422.
Paul (St.) I., Pope, 331–360.
Peada, King of Mercia, 7.
Petasius, 198.
Peter, Duke, 137, 186.
Peter's pence, 150 n.
Peter's (St.), Church, 210.
Philip, Antipope, 367.
Philippicus, Emperor, 136.
Pilgrims, Anglo-Saxon, to Rome, 148 f.
Pippin, King, 224, 271, 295, 302, 311, 342, 346, 349, 357.
Platyn, 77 f.
Ponthion, residence of Pippin, 299.
Popes, Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of, 14 f.
Popes, Election of, 59, 70.
Popes of seventh century reviewed, 99 f.
Popes of eighth century, 491.
Potho, abbot, 463.

QUINISEXT COUNCIL, 87.
Quinisext Decrees, 110 f., 133.

RATCHIS, King, 232, 318.
Ratisbon, Council of, 441.
Ravenna, city, 230.
Reginald, Duke of Clusium, 428.
Reparatus, Archbishop of Ravenna, 21.
Rodicausus, monk, 464.
Rome, walls repaired by Gregory II., 145; Council in (727), 188; (731), 205; (732), 209; Synod (743), 253; besieged, 305, 309.
Rushforth, Letter of Mr., concerning S. Maria Antiqua, 115.

SABINE TERRITORY, 430.
Saccellarius, Papal Officer, 103.
S. Silvestro in Capite, church, 339.
Saracens, 164 f.
Sardinia, church in, 66.
Saxewulf, monk, 7.
Schola cantorum, 103.
Segni, 3.
Serenus, Bishop of Forum Julii, 166 f.
Sergius, Archbishop of Ravenna, 315, 326 f.
Sergius I. (St.), Pope, 77–99.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Sergius, son of Christopher, 366.
Sidonius, priest, 245 n.
Sigebert, monk, 220.
Sinesius, envoy, 354.
Sisinnius, Pope, 124–126.
Socrates, lawyer of Constantinople, 283 f.
Soissons, Synod of (744), 241.
Spiritual relationship, 274.
Spoleto, Duke of, 344 f.
Spoleto, Duchy of, 405.
Stations, 102 f.
Stephen II., 289.
Stephen III., 290–330.
Stephen (III.) IV., 361–393.
Stephen, notary, 401.
Subiaco, monastery of, 113.
Sylvester (St.), monastery of, 357.

TARASIUS, Imperial Secretary, 446 f.
Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria, 429 f., 432 f.
Tatwine, Archbishop of Canterbury, 212.
Temporal Power of Popes, 276 f., 491.
Terni, city, 228.
Theodicius of Spoleto, 366.
Theodo, Duke of Bavaria, 151 f.
Theodore, Archbishop of Ravenna, 46 f.
Theodore, Bishop of Pavia, 274.
Theodore, monk, 10 f.
Theodore, Patriarch of Constantinople, 21.
Theophylact, Patrician, 105.
Thomas II., Patriarch of Constàntinople, 4.
Tiber, overflow of, 146 f.
Tilpin, Archbishop of Rheims, 478.
Toledo, Fourteenth Council of, 52.
Totman, 75.
Toto of Nepi, 362.
Transamund, Duke of Spoleto, 216 f., 227.

VENICE, 95 f.
Vicedominus, Papal Officer, 104.
Vincent (St.), monastery of, 163 f.
Virgilius and the Antipodes, 247.
Virgilius, priest, 245 n.
Vitalian, Pope, 3, 16.

WAIFER, Duke of Aquitaine, 347.
Waldipert, priest, 366 f.
Werner, abbot, 306.
Widman, abbot, 352.
Wighard, 9 f.
Wilfrid (St.), of York, 26 f., 37, 82.
Willibrord, St., 92.
Wulfhere, 7.

YORK, Archbishopric of, 212.

ZACARIAS, Captain of Body Guard, 91.
Zachary, Pope, 226 f.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

5 Nov 5 2 HL

REC'D LD DEC 21 1982

FEB 10 1959

Jan 21, 1983

March 21, 1983

5 Aug '60 TD

REC'D LD

AUG 3 1960

29 Oct 54 VL

RBR 10-17

DEC 14 1971 35

8 JUL 1978

REC'D LD DEC-7 PM 6 1

REC'D LD

JAN 21 1972 35

Due end of SPRING quarter
subject to recall after —

JUL 7 1957

APR 17 '73

23 ... AM

REC'D LD JAN 15 '72 -2 PM 5 4

rec'd circ. MAR 12 1983

LD 21-95m-11,'50(2877s16)476

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

150683

BX
1070
M3
v.1:2

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

5 Nov 5 2 NL

REC'D LD DEC 21 1982
Jan 21, 1983
Feb 21, 1983
March 21, 1983

FEB 19 1959

5 Aug '60 TD

29 Oct 54 VL
RBR 10 47

AUG 3 1960

DEC 14 1971 35

8 JUL '57

REC'D LD DEC -7 PM 6 1

REC'D LD

JAN 21 1972 8 5

Due end of SPRING Quarter
subject to recall after —

JUL 7 1957

23 ... 59 LAM

REC'D LD JAN 15 '72 -2 PM 5 4

rec'd circ. MAR 12 1983

LD 21-95m-11,'50(2877s16)476

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

150683

BX
1070
M3
v.1:2

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA